

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1930

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 305. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, JANUARY, 1930.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

PEACE UPON EARTH AND HOW TO GET IT.

Why do we have to spend so much time in criticising other people? Why don't we go our way and let them go theirs? Surely all the political wisdom of the age is not miraculously enshrined in the ranks of the Socialist Party! Surely all these people so disinterestedly engaged in the immediate problems of the day are not charlatans, or simpletons! How shall we answer?

To answer in a phrase is neither easy nor desirable. An instance, a typical instance, is better. A question for obvious reasons very much to the fore at the moment is that of war. Possibly no greater calamity could happen to civilisation than another Great War. If that is agreed then it follows that any efforts devoted to averting a common disaster are worthy of sympathy and support. Unfortunately, the sequence is not quite so simple as that. Our dreadful habit of criticising comes in and insists upon our examining the efforts in the light of the problem attacked. To go into more detail. Viscount Cecil is very closely identified with efforts to avoid war by means of the League of Nations. He contributed a short but pointed article to the "Listener" of November 13th, wherein he touched on the relations of Germany and her neighbours in the immediate future. He candidly admitted that the League Disarmament Commission passed a resolution last spring saying, in effect, that it was impracticable to limit the material of armies, their guns, rifles, tanks, etc. "If that decision remains," he said, "disarmament becomes little better than a farce." Very rightly, he concluded that the position is serious, but he added, "it can be met." These are his proposals:—

Let it be our part to lead the nations once

again along the path of progress and civilisation, as we may claim to have done so often in the past. Let us send our representatives to the future Disarmament negotiations authorised to take whatever steps may be necessary in order to produce that general reduction and limitation of armaments to which we are pledged by Treaty, and without which there is no hope of permanent peace.

All which, we respectfully admit, boils down to the equivalent of nothing. It is the sort of flatulent rhetoric that Lloyd George has made his own. When have we led the nations along the path of progress and civilisation? Any school history will inform us that Britannia rules the waves, and does so because we defeated the French, walloped the Dutch, spanked the Spaniard, routed the Russian, smashed the German, and so on. We do not think the nations want any leading along that path. Another point, who are the "we" that he speaks of so glibly. Does he mean you and me who have to hire ourselves out by the week to a master, or does he mean the class, of which he is one, to whom we are compelled to hire ourselves out? Viscount Cecil may claim that his "we" meant the whole nation, but we should know such a claim would be purely rhetorical. The very cleavage of society into two antagonistic classes, his, the class of privilege, and ours, the class of work and poverty, makes his "we" inadmissible.

But is the point a small one? Could he not urge that he recognised no such cleavage, that his efforts were directed to using such leisure and opportunity as his privileged position gave him, in the common interests of humanity? He could, but we would remind him of his speech at the Pilgrim's Dinner. In the absence of a printed

record, we must rely upon a pencil note made when the speech was delivered over the radio on November 22nd. After speaking of the dire and calamitous results of appealing to arms for the settlement of international disputes, he said:—

Some other means must be devised to achieve the same results.

Read that over slowly. Is it necessary to ask you to analyse so simple a statement? Perhaps it is: and to ask you further to follow up its implications.

What is the object of war? It is not to kill the greatest number of people in the shortest space of time. It is not to starve, cripple and inflict the maximum misery short of death upon women, children and invalids. It is not to destroy ships, factories, railways, oil-wells and as much of the machinery of living as possible. And yet all these things happen. The object of all war is that one nation or group may impose its will upon another. Then the first thing to find out is why one nation or group should seek to impose its will upon another. We say that the reason in all recent wars (and possibly in all wars) is an economic one, and is inherent in the structure of society. Look at the daily papers. Every day we are told of the necessity of capturing foreign markets, of beating our rivals, of defeating their attempts to capture ours. We are told to buy British goods and decline to purchase those of the foreigner. We as workers are urged to accept as small a wage as possible so that our goods will sell cheaper than those of the foreigner. The foreigner is represented to us as a person who is content to live on a microscopic wage and yet work uncomplainingly for hours longer than we: one who produces avalanches of tremendously cheap commodities and seems endowed as a commercial traveller with the knack of beating the honest Briton wherever he can get his nose in. In short, the talk is constantly in terms of economic rivalry. National marks are introduced so that the goods produced by our fellow human beings in other countries may be shut out.

Rivalry, or competition as it is called, is the keynote of Capitalism. Prosper yourself and ruin your rival is its economic creed. Man struggles with man for job, firm struggles with firm for trade, combine struggles with combine for markets, and nation struggles with nation for world trade. When the struggle becomes acute

and nation is opposed to nation, then follows war; one competitive nation seeks to impose its will upon another competitive nation. The machinery of murder piled up during the years of peace is then used for the purpose for which it was designed.

To speak, therefore, of the general reduction and limitation of armaments as a hope of permanent peace is deplorably muddled-headed. To ask for "some other means . . . to achieve the same result" is, not to use too hard a phrase, simply stupid. It is reasoning so grotesquely unrelated to the facts as to be farcical. Bootleggers defend their property with guns. Customs officers use guns to overcome the bootleggers' reluctance to let go their property. People like the Viscount suggest that a limitation of guns by mutual agreement is going to eliminate bloodshed in their occasional encounters. The lesson is obvious. Wars will cease when rivalry between nations ceases. But we have seen that international rivalry is but a logical extension of rivalry as a principle within each nation. Rivalry is a medal with two sides, on the one side is success, on the other defeat. Whilst competition is the law of economic life, prosperity for one party involves the ruin of another. "Some other means . . . to achieve the same result" as war is pathetic piffle.

The noble lord is not alone in his delusion. Captain Hashagen, the German submarine commander appeared on the same public platform as the British officer he captured during the war. Crowds of thousands applauded the spectacle and thousands of readers of the daily newspapers felt that war was becoming something very remote. When the deadly enemies of yesterday could fraternise on a public platform, surely we have moved far. It is a pity, but if the papers are right, Capt. Hashagen is credited with saying that war was a ghastly mistake and between Germany and her neighbours unthinkable, *providing* she could obtain the place to which her power and prestige as a great nation entitled her. So you will see how far we have travelled. Viscount Cecil would abolish war if by some other means we can achieve the same result. Capt. Hashagen would abolish war if we achieve the same result by some other means. But the workers can be sure of one thing. If the companies in which Viscount Cecil has invested his money, achieve

prosperity by ruining the companies in which Capt. Hashagen has his, and the process is sufficiently widespread as to be national, it will be guns and gas for it again and the working men of each country as the victims.

Our remedy is the abolition of competition, national and international, and the substitution of co-operation. We ask all intelligent people to read our literature, study our suggestions for re-organising society, and take a definite hand in the ordering of things. Cease to be led up the blind alleys of reform, cease to be humbugged by superficial thinking, cease to be the plaything of specious appeals to the emotions. Rivalry under Capitalism means death and ruin to the weakest. Socialism means the co-operation of all men, without distinction of race or colour, to use this earth as a common store-house, owned in common and worked for the common good. War is the normal outcome of Capitalism. In it the workers have nothing to lose but their lives and nothing to gain but a change of masters, a continuance of their slavery, or an intensification of their poverty. If fighting could achieve anything Socialism would be the one thing worth fighting for. Has it not been said, you have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win.

W.T.H.

STRATFORD

A MEETING

will be held at
STRATFORD TOWN HALL
on
Sunday, January 12th
at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker - E. HARDY

Subject:—"How to Get Socialism"

All Invited
Questions and Discussion. Admission Free.

READ "THE SOCIALIST"

"The Socialist," organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.), is obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office. Price 4d. a copy, post free; or 4/- a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

ASPECTS OF THE "WOMAN QUESTION."

(Based on Notes of a series of Lectures on "The Sexes in Evolution.")

(Continued from November issue).

Nearly all the accepted mental differences between men and women are the result of upbringing. It is woman's environment, particularly in childhood, that is the cause of the feeling of inferiority where it exists. From their earliest years they are acquainted with the fact that women occupy an inferior position, and take it for granted that this is proper. Even before they can possibly understand the meaning of sex they are required to believe that little girls are not so clever or original as little boys, and cannot by any means emulate them. And this brings us to the so-called sex inequality.

In a biological sense men and women are equal, and one is the complement of the other. Is not every human being that is born, whether male or female, but the outcome of the union of a man and a woman? And if we know anything at all about heredity, does it not teach us that on the average a child will receive one-half of its total heritage from its parents? There is a difference between them, both physiological and psychological, brought about in a perfectly natural way by Nature's imposition of the division of labour. But there is nothing mystical about these differences between the sexes. Each type is specialised for its own task—that of producing and caring for the two kinds of sexual cells. It is quite probable that the only real mental differences between men and women are the instincts directly concerned with sexual intercourse and the care of children. In the female mind there is as a rule a natural tinge of conservatism; she is more reserved, more emotional, and possesses more caution in the matter of taking risks. She has a quieter disposition and is less vigorous than the male, who, by contrast, is far more powerful, both in body physique and sex impulse. To the biologist there is, of course, no suggestion of inferiority or superiority in the use of these terms. They merely express the specialisation which accompanies sex in all types of animal. The possession of the uterus, and

the carrying of the young for so long a period powerfully modifies the activities and habits of the female and is the biological foundation of a great deal of our human social custom and behaviour. Reproduction and sex lie at the very foundation of marriage, home, and the family, and it is inevitable that these aspects should profoundly colour the whole human society, both as to its ideals and its structure. Though it might be true to say that woman's proper sphere is the home, we have seen that out of economic necessity woman has been driven out of the home into the workshop, with its consequent reaction on the wage status of man. When men and women recognise that their battle is one and the same we shall be much nearer to a realization of that co-operative commonwealth that all enlightened people are desirous of bringing into being.

Now, in conclusion, I have tried to show, in a somewhat rapid fashion, how the present position of woman has come about. This, as will have been apparent, cannot be understood without reference to the contemporary position of man. Under the existing system of society, women, like men, are considered to be legitimate objects of exploitation. They are employed only because they produce a profit for a less wage than a man, and because they are useful as an offset against the demands of men workers. This is not to raise an objection to the employment of women under any circumstances. Women—any more than men—ought not to be expected to lead a humdrum existence, in the home or anywhere else. There is plenty of scope for the useful employment of women—employment that could be made profitable to herself and of lasting value to the community. There are such avenues as the Arts, the Sciences, the Public Health Service, and, above all, in the field of Education, for, after all, who is better qualified to teach the young than the sex equipped for the function of motherhood?

But this will not happen until men and women bind themselves in a world-wide brotherhood, conscious of their class interests, to the end that they shall conquer political power, abolish all class privilege, make exploitation but a memory, to finally usher in a system of society wherein men and women shall enjoy to the full the fruits of their labour and be assured of the reality

of that which is now hardly more than a dream—a full, free, and joyous existence.
(Concluded.)

TOM SALA.

SHEFFIELD.

A meeting of members and sympathisers will be held at the A.E.U. Institute (Library) on Tuesday, January 21st, at 7.30 p.m. with a view to forming a branch in Sheffield.

EDINBURGH.

A meeting was held on the Mound, Edinburgh, on December 8th and a large number of questions were asked and answered relative to the Party's position, especially on Russia and the Labour Party. An apologist for the Labour Party opposed and was dealt with. Literature is now available most fine evenings on the Mound and those wishing to reorganise a Branch should communicate with D. Lamond, 15, Barclay Place.

BATTERSEA

A Lecture

will be given on

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16th

at 8.30 p.m.

at

THE WAITING ROOM.

LATCHMERE BATHS

(Entrance in Burth Road)

All Invited

Questions and Discussion.

Admission Free.

Sunday Evening

MEETINGS

at 42 GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1
(near Borough Station Underground)

Speaker:

Subject:

Jan. 5th	A. MILES	"Socialism"
Jan. 12th	H. WAITE	"Democracy"
Jan. 19th	J. STRICKETT	"Evils of Capitalism"
Jan. 26th	H. MILTON	"The Mining Situation"

All Invited.

Questions and Discussion

Admission Free.

Commence at 8 p.m.

A LOOK ROUND.

THE COMMUNIST "INTELLECTUAL."

Many workers imagined that the Communist Party were Revolutionary; but one of their leaders, R. Palme Dutt, admits in *The Workers' Life* (Nov. 15th), that it is not so. He says:—

"The chief task of the coming congress is to revolutionise the party and its leadership in readiness for the developing period of mass struggles."

According to his view they need to get rid of relics of Social Democracy and find new leaders and to get into contact with the masses. He is still talking of factory groups years after the "thesis" merchants declared that factory nuclei were the basis of the party. He states that "the question of leadership is at the centre of the whole situation."

The article is full of the usual high-sounding phrases like "orientation," "dialectics," "objective situations," but one looks in vain for any understanding of the road to Socialism. He talks of the need "to press fighting demands on the Labour Government," and never once points out that the sole need of the working class is to organise to control political power to establish Socialism.

* * *

LABOUR DEALS WITH UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Labour Government, through its leaders, MacDonald and Thomas, are continually telling us that the only real road to curing unemployment is to increase our trade—especially our export trade. One of the chief defenders of the Labour Party is *Forward* of Glasgow, which has to admit that their leaders' theory is all wrong. *Forward* quotes an answer in the House of Commons (Nov. 26th) by the President of the Board of Trade, and heads the paragraph, "More Work and Fewer Men." This is the information given by the Board of Trade:—

"The total mercantile tonnage launched in the United Kingdom in 1925 (excluding unregistered vessels of under 15 tons gross) was 1,123,049, while the estimated number of persons in the ship-building, ship-repairing, and marine engineering, etc., industries, who were insured against unemployment in July was 301,340.

"But while in 1928, the comparable tonnage had risen to 1,458,058, the insured workers in these trades had fallen to 257,460."

The "great" schemes of granting millions to railways, gas companies, road boards, etc., to make these services more efficient; plans to cheapen costs in coal and steel industries, and similar policies, are therefore bound to fail to reduce or arrest unemployment, because efficient industry increases output faster than trade increases.

Mr. Thomas said in the House of Commons (Nov. 4th) that he did not attach so much importance to work schemes as a solution of our unemployment problem as he did to the wider aspect of the "development of our export trade."

But the Labour Leaders know that when Britain's export trade was good unemployment and poverty were widespread and now that productive powers have been vastly increased in every country the increase of export trade cannot cure unemployment.

Look at America with its vast Home market and great export trade—a country in which the *Telegraph* tells us there are millions of "out-of-works"! Was it not only the other day that leading commercial men warned the motor trade that there were a million surplus motor cars in the U.S.A. looking for a market!

* * *

THE LABOUR LIBERALS.

Labour supporters criticise the Liberal Party's legislation but they forget that the Labour Party supported all the leading measures passed from 1906 to 1914, although ever since they have claimed these measures were miserly and ineffectual. How close the Liberal Party and the Labour Party were during those years can be gathered from a quotation from the "Life of Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer," by Mr. Bechofer Roberts. The reader can gather how great was the Labour Party's support of the Capitalist Reform Legislation of the Liberals.

On the Insurance Act, Snowden took a line directly opposed to the majority of his colleagues, led by Ramsay MacDonald. The Labour Party had put down amendments to the Bill; MacDonald came to an arrangement with the Government not to embarrass it by moving them.

Snowden thereupon stood down from the executive of the Labour Party, and threatened to leave it altogether if these tactics were continued. What was the I.L.P. doing, he demanded, to permit such backsliding among its nominees in the House of Commons? Really, the I.L.P. might just as well dissolve, and consider merging itself in the National Liberal Federation; there was simply no difference any longer between the Labour Party and the Liberal Party. And for his part, he wasn't going to acquiesce in this sacrifice of principles to prudence.

Followed by George Lansbury, F. W. Jowett and Will Thorne, he refused to obey the Labour Whip; they voted against their colleagues. In articles and speeches, Snowden derided the motives which dictated the tactics of MacDonald and the others. Everyone knew, he said, that four-fifths of the Labour Party's members held their seats through arrangements in their constituencies with the local Liberals; was it not ridiculous, therefore, to expect that they would dare to quarrel with the party to whose goodwill they owed their election?

The Labour Party still appeals to and depends on Liberal "goodwill."

* * *

THE GREAT LEFT WING.

Mr. Cook, the Miner's leader, has declared his entire support for the Labour Government. Mr. Cook, who said that he had a pledge for a 7-hours' day given by Mr. MacDonald locked up in his desk, is still keen on the Labour Government after they have declined to redeem that pledge. Cook still supports the Labour Government though he confesses that "during the last five months, up to October, 92,655 claims were disallowed by Insurance Officers on the grounds of 'not genuinely seeking work'." During the same period, "308,001 claims were disallowed under all the various vile provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act." Mr. Cook evidently "forgets" that the "vile" clauses of the Insurance Act were a part of the Insurance Bill passed by the Labour Government in 1924. Yet he sobs, "he has played the game with the Labour Government." He has! The Editor of the I.L.P. paper, *Forward*, describes him (Dec. 14th) as "The greatest cry-baby in Socialist Politics," but forgets to mention that neither Cook nor the I.L.P. has ever entered Socialist Politics. *Forward* refers to that curious document called "The Cook-Maxton Manifesto," in which Maxton and Co. demanded that the unemployed should get maintenance at the same scale as the employed man (since reduced by Maxton and Co. to £1 per week). *Forward* quotes a speech by W. Gallagher, the al-

leged Communist, to show that he wrote the Manifesto for Cook and Maxton. The Communist Party, it should be recalled, allowed their members to join the Cook-Maxton campaign though they didn't like the Manifesto.

Gallagher's speech at a Communist meeting in Glasgow City Hall, on April 7th, was as follows:—

I have worked with them for years, trying to instil a working-class point of view into them, and all to no purpose. They sent for me to the House of Commons, and there I took Cook down to meet them. There was Wheatley, Buchanan, Campbell Stephen, Kirkwood, and Maxton, and they informed me that they had decided to fight MacDonald and the Labour Party leaders, and wanted my advice as to what they were to do. I told them that a manifesto must be issued and I wrote it for them, and helped them to organise the campaign, and persuaded Cook to go down to St. Andrew's Hall for the opening meeting. When Wheatley was assuring me that he was out to fight the Labour Party leaders, he was busy arranging to bring Arthur Henderson down to Shettleston to speak on his behalf. No, I am absolutely finished with them, and am out to fight them.

Such is the mess that Labour and Communist Politics result in. All reform and "something now" politicians are inevitably involved in the rotten game which Cook says he has played so well.

* * *

TOO MUCH PRODUCTION.

"Is there enough wealth for all?" is a common question put by anti-Socialists. The existence of luxury all round us and the stored-up wealth that cannot find a market to-day is one aspect of the answer. But what would be the possibilities of wealth production in a society where the workers had access to the raw materials and the machines? That can be seen by the continual reports of the deliberate limitation of production to-day. In the *Observer* (Dec. 15th) there is a long article on the "Sugar Crisis," which explains that the only solution for the owners of that industry is to restrict the supply and limit production in Cuba, Java, Czechoslovakia, etc.

The increase in production of sugar has been so immense that the firms such as the Sugar Trust of America are working out a policy to keep the price up by cutting down the production.

In the same paper, on another page, there is an article on "Tin Restriction," which states that the Tin Producers' Association, in order to maintain an "economic price"

for their metal, propose the cessation of work for 32 hours each week in the mines, and a total cessation of work for one week in January and February, and, if necessary, in March. This applies to all Eastern sources of supply, and also places like Nigeria.

In modern society the ease with which wealth can be produced means lack of work for the worker but only to assure the maintenance of owners' profits. More wealth could be produced but it does not "pay" the owners to allow that to be done.

* * *

A SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC CURIOSITY.

Walton Newbold, late Communist M.P., previously in the I.L.P. and now in the S.D.F., explains his "ideas" in the issue of *Forward* for Dec. 14th. He says:—

"I am convinced that the propertied classes will never evacuate without the exercise of force. By force I mean physical compulsion. And physical compulsion is absolutely certain, in some phases, to involve an armed clash."

Walton Newbold, the Labour Party Candidate for Epping, has recently joined the Social Democratic Federation, which holds that the road to Emancipation is by means of the Labour Party. Newbold says that you can only get emancipation by an armed clash, so he joins an organisation that is opposed to it! He does not tell the electors of Epping about the "armed clash" stuff, although he claims, "I did not say one thing on the public platform and do a different thing in Parliament." And to crown all, he says, "I accept as axiomatic the Class War." In the next sentence he says, "That is why, viewing the forces ranged on either side, I have declared for a truce." So he accepts the Class War but wants it suspended for a while! No wonder the S.D.F. welcomes Newbold. He ought to make a good addition to their professional politicians. The Class War with truce!

* * *

MORE BIBLES IN RUSSIA.

An answer both to screeching Christians and uninformed Communists is contained in *The Tory Daily Record* of Glasgow (Dec. 3rd), which reported a meeting of the directors of the Royal National Bible Society of Scotland.

Letters were read from Germany with regard to the introduction of Russian Scriptures into Russia. It was stated that the demand was so great that for some time it had been out of print. "*The Soviet Government had itself been printing large numbers of Bibles in Leningrad, Kiev and Odessa.*"

Religion is evidently still widespread in Russia under dictatorship.

* * *

THE CLASS WARRIORS OF THE I.L.P.

Mr. James Maxton's recent opposition to Ramsay MacDonald on details of Unemployment Insurance recalls to us how often he has voted for him as leader, and made the usual sentimental eulogies and declarations of loyalty to MacDonald. At the Memorial Hall debate with our late comrade, Fitzgerald, Mr. Maxton said the I.L.P. were not heresy hunters and therefore did not expel their members who supported the Capitalists. Of course, the I.L.P. could not be expected to do this as it would leave them without a membership. When, however, it helps them to catch votes they do expel members, but not on Socialist grounds. They expelled some of their members in Glasgow recently for voting for booze licences. They did not want to lose a lot of their "unco guid" supporters.

* * *

PEACE!—BUT MORE ARMS.

How much nonsense is being written and spoken of the great achievements of the Labour Government in promoting peace schemes! The Kellogg pact was one of the so-called great pillars of peace of which Labour is proud; and it is interesting, therefore, to read in *The Daily Herald* (Dec. 16th) of the U.S.A. Senator Borah's speech:—

"I think that the best evidence of a belief that the Kellogg Pact had removed all question of neutral rights at sea would be a drastic reduction in armaments."

If the Peace Pact eliminated all question of rights of neutrals at sea, what can be the reasons for such vast navies? If we do not expect any conflicts at sea, and all conditions in that regard are removed by the Kellogg Pact, then let us manifest our faith in the Pact by taking away the crushing burden of armaments which we are now carrying.

The Senator doesn't realise that Labour Governments intend to "humanise" war!

K.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free..	..	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 8d.

The Socialist Standard,

JANUARY,



1930

LABOUR PARTY'S MAIN PLANK GONE.

The principle which above all distinguishes the Socialist Party from the Labour Party is our realisation that there are no short and easy cuts to Socialism.

Only a party whose members understand and want Socialism can work to that end, and the growth of such a party cannot proceed faster than the work of spreading socialist knowledge. It was in protest against the view we hold that the I.L.P. and the Labour Party were formed. They have always proclaimed their belief in the possibility of building up a party on a non-socialist basis, becoming the government of the country and introducing large measures of reform—old-age pensions, minimum wage acts and the like, and so retaining the support of the electors while leading them, almost without their knowledge, on the road to Socialism. The fallacy of that position, briefly stated, is that until we have Socialism, we shall continue to have Capitalism and Capitalism can be run only on Capitalist lines. You cannot retain capitalist private ownership and control, and yet administer the system in a way which will prevent it from producing its normal effects. You cannot have Capitalism without a subject class of wage and salary earners struggling incessantly against the pressure which tends

to make them more insecure and badly paid, drives them to harder work and reduces them in greater numbers to unemployment. The success of their theory rests upon the ability of a Labour Government to satisfy the electors; but the electors will want the results which they were led to expect and the Government cannot deliver the goods. For years we have been told by Labour Party supporters (who had never tried to teach or even to understand Socialism) that the working class did not want Socialism, they wanted "something now." We return the jibe and ask when the Labour Government is going to give it to them. We were told that "half-a-loaf is better than no bread" and that the way to get Socialism is to build it up piecemeal, adding one gain to another until some day we shall wake up and find that Capitalism has imperceptibly changed into the co-operative commonwealth. One "half-loaf" has already been delivered to the cotton workers by the Labour Government—a 6½ per cent. reduction in pay instead of the 12½ per cent. asked for by the employers. May we ask how many such half-loaves will be required to produce Socialism?

Mr. J. H. Thomas, addressing the annual general meeting of the National Union of Railwaymen at Southampton, on July 5th of this year, threw overboard the main plank of his party's policy when he said:—

We ask you not to expect too much, nor attempt to force from us, because we are a Labour Government, what you would not force from a Capitalist Government.—(*Daily Herald*, 6th July, 1929.)

A few months before the Labour Government took office, Mr. Philip Snowden, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, wrote a pamphlet, "Wealth or Commonwealth," in which he stated his party's intentions. He wrote that

The taxation of the rich for the purposes of national reconstruction and for social reforms is a means of re-distributing the national income so as to lessen social evils and inequalities.—

(Quoted in the *New Leader*, 20th December.)

On October 24th Mr. Snowden returned to the subject in a speech at Sheffield, reported in the *Manchester Guardian* on October 25th. It will be noticed that Mr. Snowden administering Capitalism does not see eye to eye with Mr. Snowden seeking non-Socialist votes. He stated on this occasion that he had no wish to extract from

the Capitalist class concessions to improve the position of the workers.

The last thing a Chancellor of the Exchequer wants to do is to add to the burden of taxation, and this assurance at least I can give you, that, if I should be in the painful circumstances of having to do that it will be from sheer necessity and not with any desire to inflict new taxation upon what I have sometimes described as "the idle rich."—(*Manchester Guardian*, 25th October.)

Then Mr. J. H. Hudson, M.P., the Parliamentary Secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, writing in a Sunday newspaper, supplemented his chief's remarks and explained why it is impossible for the Labour Party to carry out its programme within the Capitalist system. If heavier taxation were imposed on the rich, they would, according to Mr. Hudson, invest abroad, let their factories fall into disrepair, and find devious ways of nullifying the intentions of the Government.

International complexities are driving us to see that our expectations of deriving from Capitalists and financiers the means to support our schemes of social improvement must give place to the better Socialist plan. When we really control our own industrial machine, we can then decide how the surplus shall be spent on the communal welfare without reference to the evasions of those who now add so greatly to our difficulties.—(Quoted in *The New Leader*, December 20th.)

It will be noticed that the three spokesmen of the Government do not use exactly the same form of words for their declarations. Mr. Thomas says that the workers must not ask for their "something now"; Mr. Snowden says that he won't try to get it for them; and Mr. Hudson says that it can't be got—three different ways of saying that there isn't going to be any half-loaf. But if the Labour Government cannot save the working class from the effects of Capitalism why are they in office? And if, as Mr. Hudson says, the "Socialist plan" is the only practicable one, what is the Labour Party's justification for going into Parliament without obtaining from the electors a mandate for Socialism? In short, what becomes of the case against the Socialist Party?

DEATH OF A COMRADE.

We regret to learn of the death, at the age of 82, of John Haughton, for many years an active worker for Socialism and well-known to members of the Edmonton Branch of which he was one of the earliest members. He was interred at Old Southgate Cemetery.

DICTATORSHIP OR DEMOCRACY?**SHAW'S APPLE-CART UPSET.**

Most of our readers no doubt have heard or read of George Bernard Shaw. It is not Shaw's fault if they haven't. He has done his best to make himself known and has, on the whole, succeeded fairly well.

His combination of a shrewd wit with an equally shrewd ambition has enabled him to rise in a society wherein the superficial brilliance of diamonds is of greater esteem than the solid utility of the humbler foundation stone.

A master of paradox, he poses as the supreme contradiction, the wealthy Socialist. In the 'eighties he claimed to have superseded Marx by means of a kind of Irish stew of David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill and Stanley Jevons. (See "The Economic Basis of Socialism," Fabian Essays.) This was somewhat sadly burnt in the frying pan by his fellow-Capitalist, H. M. Hyndman, in "Economics of Socialism" (see chapter on the Final Futility of Final Utility), but such ambitious chefs as Shaw are undeterred by little accidents like that.

So, more recently, he has made a further hash of things entitled "The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism," in which juicy bits of real information are all but totally submerged in a sticky mess of rubbish. Shaw appears to have learned little about Socialism during the last forty years and that little he admittedly owes to Marx. He can give us an effective description of the effects of Capitalism and even indicate their underlying basis, but his attitude towards that basis is as unsound as ever. The blunders of the Third International give him something more to talk about and a chance to show off, by contrast, his supposed practical political sagacity. Upon examination, however, his sneers at the "Marxist fanatics" only turn out to be another case of the pot calling the kettle black. So far from Shaw's Socialism being a science he boldly avows it is as a religion, a curious blend of sentiment with childish fantasy and prophetic cocksureness.

Confronted with concrete issues Shaw asks, not "how does it arise?" nor "what is the solution?" but "who is right?" Thus in an article in the *Labour Monthly* of October 15th, 1921, he condemned the miners in Britain for striking, and praised the Soviet Government for shooting men for slacking and shirking at their work. Com-

pulsory work, he held, was dictated by "the irresistible logic of facts and of real responsibility." (p. 312). His article was dated August 10th. The very next day the Soviet Government published their New Economic Policy. The attempt to introduce "Communism" from above by compulsion failed and the seer had written a day too soon; but he did not learn his lesson nor cease to worship with all the fervour of his vegetarian heart the brutal "directness" of Lenin, Mussolini and Pilsudski.

In his attempt to impress his wisdom upon the intelligent ladies of his class Shaw makes no secret of his "despair of democracy" and his faith in the "intellectuals" and in those capitalists who are in danger of immediate precipitation into the ranks of the workers through the development of Capitalism.

This group provides the finance and "brains" of the Labour Party; but Shaw is by no means optimistic concerning the ability of this party to hold together once it has acquired office. Recent events confirm his fears of the danger of splits fostered by the rival ambitions of different leaders and discontent among their working-class followers. For Shaw, "Socialism" is something to be imposed upon us with or without our consent by the Civil Service. It is, in other words, expert Capitalist government tending towards equality of income by means of taxation, nationalisation and an increase in insurance and pension schemes. Hence the support of the workers is desirable inasmuch as it may smooth the pathway of the administrators; but Shaw is uncomfortably conscious of an awkward fact—the class struggle.

While his Fabian politicians and permanent officials are trying to hold society together in order to keep their cushy jobs, the irreconcilables may refuse to be reconciled. The capitalists may lock-out or, worse still, the workers may strike; to which emergency Shaw's timid Fabianism answers in one word—"Dictatorship!" (pp. 379-380).

This magic phrase expresses in inverted form the hopeless confusion in which Shaw lands himself and his readers in his frantic endeavour to appear wise. Here are one or two examples.

Discussing the subsidy to the mine-owners in 1925 he says "The people who say such subsidies are Socialistic . . . are

talking nonsense. They are frank exploitations of the taxpayer by bankrupt Capitalism" (p. 305).

Reverting to the same subject (on pp. 387, 388) he tells us that "the capitalists themselves have established the Socialistic practice of subsidising private business."

In sections 57-62 (pp. 268-284) he tries to show that compensation (to be provided by taxation) is necessary to avoid "revolution." On page 372, however, we are told "It may quite possibly happen that even if the most perfect Fabian Acts of Parliament be passed . . . the capitalists may . . . try to prevent by force the execution of the Fabian acts. We should then have a state of civil war"; while on p. 376, he admits that "a political revolution may be necessary to break the power of the opponents of Socialism."

In the face of this it is difficult to avoid drawing the obvious conclusion, namely, that Fabianism is an attempt to prolong "the power of the opponents of Socialism."

Further items of interest to members of the working-class who make no claim to Shaw's level of intelligence, are statements to the effect that the army and navy and the police force, as well as the Church of England, are "communistic institutions" (see pp. 13-15) because, forsooth, their services are available to rich and poor alike. Workers on strike will no doubt appreciate this.

On page 18 we are informed that "money is the most convenient thing in the world; we could not possibly do without it." Under Shaw's special brand of "Socialism" the whole paraphernalia of commodity-production, buying and selling, etc., would thus continue to exist, thus implying the private property which he professes to get rid of.

Again, "Thoughtless people think a brickmaker more of a producer than a clergyman," is another sample of Shavian wit. What does a brickmaker produce? Under Capitalist society he produces profits for his kind exploiter and the function of the clergyman is to persuade him that he should love his exploiter as himself. Shaw's easy-going facetiousness as shown in the above instance is only typical of his incurably conceited notion that the so-called intelligentsia are as necessary as the workers to social life in the future.

Professional parsons and playwrights appear in his eyes as among the eternal necessities; but these brainy people recognise

that in order to bluff the common herd and safeguard their own position they require the assistance of another special body of intellectual tools, namely, the professional politicians, male and female. The more "advanced" of these tricksters will, no doubt, find in Shaw's writings most valuable aid in specious "arguments" and verbal jugglery. But members of the working-class requiring an understanding of their position will find them worse than useless. Nothing prevents intelligent political action by the workers more effectively than confusion, and, so far as this country is concerned, we have no hesitation in handing George Bernard Shaw the palm—as the master-confusionist. E.B.

DEATH OF A "HERO."

The following actual incident is related by Robert Graves in his recent book "Good-bye to All That." The person referred to as the "Actor" was an officer—British.

At last Thomas's orderly appeared, saying, "Captain's orders, sir: A Company to move up to the front line." It seems that at that moment the storeman appeared with the rum. He was hugging the rum bottle, without rifle or equipment, red-faced and retching. He staggered up to the Actor and said, "There you are, sir, then fell on his face in the thick mud of a sump-pit at the junction of the trench and the siding. The stopper of the bottle flew out and what was left of the three gallons bubbled on the ground. The Actor said nothing. It was a crime deserving the death penalty. He put one foot on the storeman's neck, the other in the small of his back, and trod him into the mud. Then he gave the order, "Company, forward!" The Company went forward with a clatter of steel over the body, and that was the last heard of the storeman.

EAST LONDON.

LECTURES

at 141 BOW ROAD

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10th

Speaker:—W. E. McHAFFIE
Subject—"Socialism and Psychology."

FRIDAY, JANUARY 24th

Speaker:—H. WAITE
Subject—"Is Socialism Inevitable?"

Commence at 8 p.m.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.
All Invited.

ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT.

SOCIALISM AND THE GOLD STANDARD.

We have received a further letter—too long to print in full—from Mr. Edwin Wright, in which he attempts to substantiate statements made in his last letter (see December "S.S."), and introduces a number of fresh points additional to those already being discussed. We deal below with the issues raised last month.

The first issue was Mr. Wright's denial of our statement that banks make profit by receiving money on deposit and lending it out at a higher rate of interest than the rate they pay to depositors. Mr. Wright's "evidence" to support his denial consists of a statement which he attributes to Mr. McKenna. Mr. Wright says:—

Mr. McKenna denies that banks pay their way by merely borrowing from one person and lending to another. His exact words are: "Every bank loan creates a deposit," which is a denial that banks lend money already deposited, if cheques are used.

In our last issue we invited Mr. Wright to say which part of our statement he considered to be wrong. It will be noticed that he does not attempt to do so, but relies entirely on a mere assertion by Mr. McKenna; an assertion unaccompanied by argument or evidence. Let us therefore repeat the statement:—(a) banks receive money on deposit; (b) they pay interest to depositors; (c) they lend money at interest; (d) the interest they pay is less than the interest they receive. Neither Mr. Wright nor anyone else can deny the accuracy of these four propositions.

And now let us see what another banker has to say about the statement attributed to Mr. McKenna.

The late Mr. Walter Leaf, Chairman of the Westminster Bank, in his book "Banking" (Williams & Norgate. 1926) dealt with this question. He wrote as follows:—

It has indeed been argued that every loan by the banks creates a deposit; that as long as the banks go on increasing their loans, so long will their deposits grow in the same degree, and that thus the banks can be regarded as creating credit. Unfortunately, this theory will not stand confrontation with the facts . . . the course of events in the first half of the year, 1925, gives a decisive answer to this hypothesis.—(P. 102.)

He then gave figures showing that an increase in the amount of loans and advances made by the "Big Five" Joint Stock Banks, from £746 million in January, 1925, to £775 million in June, was accompanied

by a decrease in deposits from £1,515 million in January to £1,490 million in June.

The second issue raised by Mr. Wright was his statement (see December "S.S.") that Marx and Marxians "approve of a gold standard." We denied this and asked for evidence. Mr. Wright now offers his evidence. He writes:—

In "Value, Price & Profit," Marx says, "Even in England the mechanism (of banking) is less perfect than in Scotland."—(P. 28.)

Now Marx unfortunately helps the banker and the rich rather than us. On page 110/111 of 1 Vol. Edition of "Capital," he states: "It is necessary that the quantity of gold be greater than that required as coin. This condition is fulfilled by hoards," and (P. 110) "this mass of gold must be capable of expansion and contraction." On page 99 he writes, "The erroneous opinion that it is prices that are determined by the quantity of money . . . this opinion is based on the absurd hypothesis that money is without value when it first circulates." On page 102, Marx states, "Money based on credit implies conditions totally unknown to us."

These quotations, according to Mr. Wright, show that Marx "approved the gold standard," and that he "admired our money system," and that he "defends bankers."

We would first point out that the last "quotation" is not as Marx wrote it but as it appears after being "doctored" by Mr. Wright.

The correct quotation is "Money based upon credit implies on the other hand conditions, which from our standpoint of the simple circulation of commodities are as yet totally unknown to us." (Capital. Volume I. Kerr Edition. P. 143.)

Taken in its context this passage is clear enough and has a meaning totally different from the one assumed by Mr. Wright. Marx is developing an argument stage by stage and in this passage he reminds his reader that he was not "as yet" considering "money based upon credit."

He did consider it later in Volume I and in Volumes II and III, the existence of which appears to be unknown to our critic.

Mr. Wright fails to realise the whole purpose of the work "Capital." Mr. Wright imagines that the passages he quotes are intended to be statements of the policy which Marx advocated. This is a childish misunderstanding. "Capital" in general and the passages quoted are statements of the way in which Capitalism was in fact working when Marx studied it.

They are offered as statements of fact,

not as tributes to or attacks on bankers.

Mr. Wright's further contention is that his schemes for money reform "will enable Socialism and Communism to be established far more easily than you hope for." He himself provides the answer to his illusory hopes. Having quoted Mr. McKenna as his authority for what he erroneously believes to be a fact about banking, he then admits that Mr. McKenna "thinks that Capitalism can be saved by money reform." So that Mr. Wright's short cut to Socialism is believed by Mr. McKenna to be a way to the salvation of Capitalism.

Next Mr. Wright bases the operation of his scheme on the existence of "a Socialist Government."

In other words, Mr. Wright's schemes cannot be operated until after the working-class have become Socialist and have obtained power. When that condition exists the working-class will use their power for the purpose of establishing Socialism not for the purpose of introducing some trivial alteration in the method by which Capitalism manages its currency. Socialism involves production for use, not for sale and will therefore require no currency system. We, therefore, in agreement with Marx, do not advocate a gold standard or any other currency system. We advocate Socialism.

ED. COMM.

KNOWLEDGE.

The following Books can be obtained from Head Office:—

Anarchism and Socialism. Plechanoff. 3/6, paper 1/2.

Civil War in France. Marx 2/9.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. Engels. 5/-

Critique of Political Economy. Marx. 6/6.

18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon. Marx. 3/6.

Evolution of Property. Lafargue. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Engels. 3/6.

Poverty of Philosophy. Marx. 6/6.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. Marx. 3/6, limp 1/6.

Social and Philosophical Studies. Lafargue. 3/6.

Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. Engels. 3/6, limp 1/6. Postage extra.



Send your TINFOIL to the
General Secretary at the Head
Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

THE SOCIALIST LABOUR PARTY RUNS AWAY.

In previous issues of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD we have challenged the *Weekly People* of New York to quote any reference where Marx made the statement quoted by them on Trade Unionism. Many issues of the *People* have appeared, but we still wait for an answer. The only attempt made by them to refer to our challenge was in the issue of August 10th, where the National Secretary, Arnold Peterson, spends a column and a quarter on abusing us, but fails to meet the challenge.

The statement which they allege Marx to have made was as follows:—

Only the Trade Union is capable of setting on foot a true political party of labor and thus raise a bulwark against the power of Capital.

For many years the S.L.P. used this "quotation" to justify their advocacy of an industrial union which could take and hold the means of production. They also used it to support their argument that only an economic organisation could "take and hold" and that a political party was doomed to defeat without an economic organisation ready to supply the "might."

The S.L.P. say that they got the "quotation" from a magazine which is opposed to Marxism—their only "authority" is a reform journal called *The New Yorker Volkzeitung*, run by the German section of the social democrats of New York. This was a paper which De Leon never tired of denouncing—but in face of our challenge they fall back on that paper as their authority.

To avoid dealing with our challenge *The Weekly People* talk about something else.

We quoted "Value, Price & Profit," to show that Marx had no illusions about Unions being the instrument of emancipation. When dealing there with the limitation of hours of work he said:—

As to the limitation of the working day in England, as in all other countries, it has never been settled, except by legislative interference. Without the working men's continuous pressure from without, that interference would never have taken place. But, at all events, the result was not to be attained by private settlement between the working men and the Capitalists. This very necessity of general political action affords the proof that in its merely economic action, Capital is the stronger side.

This quotation amply shows his view of the weakness of economic action. But the

S.L.P. say that it only refers to action under Capitalism. If, however, the economic action of the workers is unable to win in the smaller battles under Capitalism how much less could economic action "take and hold" the means of wealth production!

Instead of meeting this point, *The Weekly People* quote the last few lines of "Value, Price & Profit," which tell the Trade Unions that they should use their organised forces "as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class—that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system."

In their article, *The People* assert that Marx stated that the economic organisation was the lever of emancipation. Nowhere did Marx make such a statement. The Socialist Party does not deny that the Trade Unions can assist in the struggle, but we hold with Marx that political action is the stronger action. We hold with Marx that the FIRST step in the emancipation of the working class "is to win political power." (See Communist Manifesto.)

The People's quotation from "Value, Price & Profit," has no reference whatever to the mare's nest discovered by the S.L.P.—that only the economic organisation can set on foot the political party of Labour.

A. KOHN.

BOUND VOLUMES

OF

The "Socialist Standard."

For the Years between Sept., 1910, and Aug., 1918.

1-Year Volume, post free 4/3; 2-Year Volume, post free 5/9; 3-Year Volume, post free 7/-.

From Sept., 1918, onwards.

1-Year Volume, post free 4/-; 2-Year Volume, post free 5/6; 3-Year Volume, post free 6/9.

Prices quoted upon application for Volumes of 4 Years and Upwards.

All Volumes of the "Socialist Standard" are bound in stiff cloth, and can be obtained from the

Socialist Party of Gt. Britain,

Head Office: 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

HAVE YOU READ THIS PAMPHLET?

"SOCIALISM."

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

HOW TO GET RICH.

Ex-Sergeant Goddard was recently defendant in an action brought by the Crown for the recovery of money which he was believed to have received as bribes. The amount was about £12,000 and everyone knew that he could not have saved £12,000 out of his pay. One of the newspaper gossip writers remarked that an "ordinary honest man" would take a lifetime to save so much money. He would indeed if by "ordinary honest man" were meant the average worker. According to the Ministry of Labour, the weekly earnings of manual workers numbering over five million and spread over all the principal industries, averaged about 50/- per head in 1924. (See Ministry of Labour Gazette, July, 1927.)

The Capitalist class live out of the difference between the value of the goods produced by the workers and the amount paid to the latter as wages and salaries. The Capitalists are able to do this because they own and control the means of production and distribution and can, in consequence, compel the workers to accept employment on these terms—the alternative being unemployment. It is interesting to consider how these fortunate property-owners came to be in the privileged position which they occupy and to consider what hope members of the working-class have of climbing up beside them.

To save £12,000 in a working life of 40 years would necessitate the putting away of more than the British worker's total weekly earnings even after allowing for the accumulation of interest. We can, therefore, safely assume that people do not get rich by saving, if all they have to save out of is the wage of a worker. We are nevertheless always being reminded that this or that millionaire started life as a paper boy or a boot-black, and is a "self-made man," the implication being that wealth is normally the result of the individual's hard work and ability. Mr. Josiah Wedgwood, B.Sc. (Econ.) has now given us the results of a special inquiry which he undertook in order to find out exactly where the rich get their money.

The results of the Inquiry are set out at length in "The Economics of Inheritance." (George Routledge & Sons. 1929. Price 12s. 6d.)

It is impossible in brief space even to summarise the elaborate material on which Mr. Wedgwood bases his conclusions. It

is, however, interesting to notice that in a review the "Economist" (23rd November) recognises it as "an important book" and has no criticism to offer of the method by which the conclusions are arrived at, nor of the conclusions.

Mr. Wedgwood's first important conclusion is that

The proportion of the total property before the War derived from inheritance may be put at round about three-fifths.

(See p. 120). In other words, our property class in 1912 derived less than half their accumulated wealth from savings out of their annual incomes. They were rich mainly because their fathers were rich.

Mr. Wedgwood made a separate inquiry into the sources of the wealth of a considerable number of wealthy people who died recently, basing his examination on documents filed in the Probate Registry at Somerset House. He found that

Of the Men in the upper and middle classes at the present day, about one-third owe their fortunes almost entirely to inheritance, . . . another third to a combination of ability and luck with a considerable inheritance of wealth and business opportunity, and the remaining third largely to their own activities.—(P. 163.)

Mr. Wedgwood points out that "many in the third category, though receiving little or no actual property by inheritance or gift, had received a superior education or relatively expensive training." (P. 164.)

We see, therefore, that the way to get rich is to choose your parents wisely, failing which your chance is small. It is still possible to climb but possible only for the very few who are very lucky.

Lastly, Mr. Wedgwood tells us what are our chances of getting our foot on the ladder.

The figures . . . suggest that not one in a thousand of the sons of working men (or wage-earners) ever accumulate as much as £10,000 (P. 157), and perhaps 1 in 100 leave £1,000 and over. (Footnote to P. 157.)

We would add a note of warning to any reader who fancies himself as a likely starter for the £10,000 stakes. Ex-Sergeant Goddard, who was paid by the propertyless few to protect their property against the propertyless many, thought he saw a way of proving that Capitalism never keeps a good man down. But he committed the unforgivable crime of being found out and is now serving a sentence of 18 months' hard labour.

The moral of all this is that if you are born into the ranks of the Capitalist class you have an excellent chance of living well

and dying with more wealth than your father before you; if you are born a worker you will live hard and die as poor as you began—unless you join with us to get Socialism. H.

SOCIALISM AND ART.

"The whole way along, Capitalism has stifled Art and tortured the artist. For Art there has been a cramped and narrowed existence; for the artist starvation during his best years, and fame when he was too old to enjoy it. There never was a system which was so noxious to Art as this of Capitalism. All the accusations that it hurls at Socialism will rebound with redoubled vigour against its own lying head. The most inconceivably unrefined Socialistic state could not do worse than degrade Art and starve the artist. What will the ordinary Socialist State of our dreams do?"

"Firstly, with regard to your genuises. Well, the bureau idea is a rotten one. We have the rudiments of it now in the various scholarships to Schools of Painting and Schools of Music, although they have not tried it yet in respect to Literature. You may discover and encourage technical talent like this—but the chances are that genius will go unnoticed, if nothing more. In such schemes you are bound to have examiners and selectors of a sort, and anything novel (as all works of genius are bound to appear until you get used to them) may give them the impression that it is only bad or eccentric. Genius takes some little time to be appreciated, and then a whole people is always a safer judge than an individual who is asked to give an immediate opinion. But, frankly, is there any reason why you should thus keep the artists as a breed apart, a sort of Levites? A poet eats, sleeps, and drinks, and (if he is a sensible man) plays billiards. There seems to me to be no valid reason why he should not spend three or four hours a day in some socially necessary labour, mental or physical—always giving him a choice of occupation, of course. Our error at present is not in forcing artists to take up other work in order to earn their living, but in giving them so much of this other work, or such distasteful work, that their energies are sapped and their thought deadened."

"And as for the community at large, it seems as clear as daylight to me that better material conditions and a freer life will bring

out again all those instincts which in many men are suppressed under Capitalism. Art will give pleasure to work and beauty to the world. And beauty breeds like every other living thing—except the upper classes. The more beautiful the world becomes, the more men's efforts will be centred on making it beautiful. On what lines these efforts will run it were a little rash to attempt to forecast. Men will attempt to abolish ugliness wherever possible; ugliness in social conditions of all sorts, in their dwellings, in their clothes, in their habits, in every single article they use. One can scarcely agree with Ruskin that the destruction of all machinery is desirable. But still, it is highly probable that in a Communist society, men, as regards certain articles of everyday use, would rather go without machinery, and do a little more work, in order to get the beauty that only handicraft can give. Many ugly things, too, that we see around us to-day, would disappear of their own accord, because they are only in existence to satisfy an artificial need created by the Capitalists in order to find an investment for a portion of their surplus capital. . . . Every man who is working for human happiness is, whether he knows it or not, following in the footsteps of the great artists of the past and clearing the road for the great artists of the future."

J. C. SQUIRE.

The above is taken from a pamphlet published by the Social Democratic Federation in 1907. It is interesting as an artist's viewpoint, for Squire was a very fine poet, as most modern anthologies bear witness. It is also interesting from another point of view. Squire became a leading writer for one of the most influential Capitalist papers, the *Sunday Times*, and eventually stood as Liberal candidate for a London division. As he points out, the artist, like every other human being, must eat and drink in order to live—and the hand of Capital is heavy!

GILMAC.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday	Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1, 8 p.m.
...	Clapham Common, 11 a.m.
...	Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
...	Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
...	Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Wednesdays	Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.	
Sundays	Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
...	Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
GLASGOW BRANCH.	
Sundays	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communicat on to Sec. as above.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Baker, 18, Orpingley Road, N.7.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 306. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE NAVAL CONFERENCE?

At the moment of writing the stage is being prepared for the Five-Power Naval Conference, whose object is to solve the problem that could not be solved at the 1927 Geneva Conference.

What is this problem? To those who have not given much thought to it, the problem appears to be the question of the peace of the world, and this view is supported by the frequent references in newspapers, pamphlets and books, to the "spirit of peace," the "spirit of humanity," the "spirit of the Kellogg Pact," and various other spineless spirits. Now one can hardly attribute any of these forms of "spiritualism" to governments who are prepared to use the latest forms of warfare against striking workers; and who are prepared, as in England, to allow the bulk of the workers in a dying industry, the coal industry, to starve or depend upon individual charity.

In fact, the problem is not the peace of the world but an attempt to set a limit to the ruinous expenditure upon armaments. A writer in the "Sunday Times" for January 19th put the problem in a nutshell when he wrote: "Good will come out of the Conference if only in the Budgets of the nations."

The naval armament position is similar to the military and aerial. It is a race between attacking and defensive forces.

A hundred years ago the warship was a wooden vessel propelled by the wind and armed with a quantity of small cannon. The projectiles fired by these cannon could have been carried about by the crew. The cost of such men-of-war was so small that

they could be built and fitted out by private people. The increase in cost came with the increase in weight and explosive power of the projectile. This brought with it necessary improvements in the construction of ships to withstand the shock of firing and also improvements in defensive armour to resist the enemy's fire.

Towards the end of the Crimean War the ironclad warship was devised, driven by steam. At first it was slow and clumsy and the iron plates were only a few inches thick, though this was quite sufficient to resist the projectiles of the times. The wealth and science of each nation was then called upon in the headlong race to produce a navy capable of holding the sea against all others. As wealth and scientific knowledge grew, the expenditure upon naval armaments grew even more tremendous and the giant battleship was still supreme.

By the end of the last century the wealthiest nations had succeeded in building floating castles that cost millions of pounds to construct and keep in fighting condition. Steam drove them, steered them, raised and lowered the boats, and accomplished many other feats formerly done by the unaided hands. Their armour plate was several feet thick; their heavy guns weighed over two hundred tons each, and they hurled projectiles over two thousand pounds in weight to tremendous distances. At the outbreak of the war in 1914 one of these heavy guns could fire at and hit a target over twenty miles away.

But still the building of heavier armed and more expensive ships goes on, with oil as the motive power. Improvement pro-

ceeds at such a rate that a battleship is rendered obsolete almost as soon as it leaves the slips. Each capitalist nation, therefore, sees with agony a huge part of its wealth going into the bottomless pit of battleship building, and is looking in every direction for some means to end the increasing drain on profits.

In the meantime a fresh war horror had come into existence at the end of last century—the submarine. Its early growth was a subject for curiosity and schoolboy tales. Then 1914 finally demonstrated the value of the submarine and small fast war craft, and showed that the battleship was little more than a white elephant, the torpedo found the weak spots in everything.

Towards the end of the war, yet another and more efficient arm was added to the Navy as a defence against the submarine, and that was the aircraft carrying torpedoes and bombs. The submarine was slow, but it was invisible, and herein lay its strength. The aeroplane high up can "spot" a submarine at the lowest depth it can safely sail. On top of this, submarine building has become more costly as the submarines have grown larger and more heavily armed. France has just completed a submarine vessel of 3,000 tons—a small battleship, the cost of which was over a million pounds.

The latest improvement in the aeroplane is direction by wireless. By this means an aeroplane carrying gas bombs and torpedoes can cruise over a wide area dealing death in all directions while its operators remain practically immune from damage. So we may now expect a further development to meet and render useless this latest weapon of horror. Where will it all end? The capitalist can see no end but the continued production of ever more terrible means of causing destruction. He is not concerned with the scrapping of implements of war, but only with decreasing their cost.

So, finally, the high ideals of the Naval Conference are really £ s. d., and have as much concern for real warfare of humanity as the capitalist has for the general welfare of his wage slaves. This was made perfectly clear in one of the resolutions of the League of Nations Economic Conference at Geneva in May, 1927, which affirmed:—

The world as a whole still devotes considerable sums to armaments and to preparations for war, which reduce the savings available for the development of industry, commerce, and agriculture,

and are a heavy burden upon the finances of the different States, entailing heavy taxation, which reacts upon their whole economic life and lowers their standard of living.

—("The Economist Supplement," 28/5/1927.)

It will be noticed that in all the official arguments on the question of armament, with the exception of Russia, there has been no suggestion of the absolute abolition of all armaments—it has only been a question of limitation. And from the English side there has been no hint of limiting its most effective weapon—the bomb and torpedo-carrying aeroplane. This is significant of the ideas behind the talk—although we have a Labour Government!

There are, however, elements of humour in the situation, and one has been provided by the "New Leader" of January 17th. In its editorial columns we read:—


The memorandum signed by 77 Labour Members of Parliament urging that the delegates of the Government at the Naval Conference should make the abolition of battleships and warships over 10,000 tons one of the principal aims of their deliberation, has our heartiest approval.

What imbecility! One might as well urge that each ship should have one gun less. The net result of the adoption of this recommendation would simply be the setting of the problem to naval experts of making the 10,000-ton ship as destructive a weapon as the 20 or 25 thousand ton ship, and America has already demonstrated that it can be done. But apart from that side of the problem, what has become of the alleged peaceful aims of the I.L.P.? They approve a Memorandum which says: "One of the principal aims is to be limitation." Has it not occurred to the I.L.P. that there is such a thing as total abolition?

But then, of course, the I.L.P., by its support of the Labour Party, anticipates the indefinite continuance of capitalists whose interests are at present being so well served by MacDonald, Thomas, Snowden & Co.

Armaments are the fighting power of the State and the State in the hands of those who resist Socialism is the bulwark of Capitalism. It, and its fighting forces will last as long as Capitalism lasts, because Capitalism signifies the existence of a subject class to be held in bondage.

GILMAC.

 **Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.**

HOW NOT TO GET SOCIALISM.

THE WAY OF THE COMMUNISTS.

The "Daily News," on January 16th, reported Dr. Brown, President of the Baptist Union, as having said that the Baptists last year lost 4,450 church members and 11,000 Sunday School scholars; in ten years, he added, they would at that rate be "as dead as the dodo."

This is bad news for the Baptists, and we believe it will also be bad news for the Communist Party. For it appears that when they were hard at work preaching the "United Front," Baptist ministers as well as the Labour Party were to be brought within the fold. Those who think that there must be a limit to the silliness even of the Communists are asked to read the following. It is a letter printed on the front page of the "Workers' Weekly," on December 7th, 1923, at a time when a general election was in progress. It is headed, "Helping Ramsay Mac.," and is signed by J. Stokes, of Portabbot:—

There is a straight fight in the constituency between Byass, the Capitalist candidate (Unionist), and Ramsay MacDonald. Ramsay MacDonald has all the way to go; if he gets there, that will be all.

We had a meeting here on November 19th with Ramsay MacDonald, who had three Baptist Ministers on the platform. It was a jolly meeting, and I was most pleased to hear these fellows speaking. We Communists here are doing our best to help Ramsay MacDonald to beat the Capitalist candidate.

DEEDS, NOT WORDS.

The same issue of the "Workers' Life" contains many other delightful sidelights on Communist activities. There is, for example, an illustration of what is meant by that favourite slogan of the Communist Party: "Now is the time for action."

"Comrade Mowatt" writes from Barrow to say that the local Communist Party were working hard to get Mr. J. Bromley returned to Parliament as Labour M.P., and he adds, "all our illusions and theoretical deductions have been hung out on the clothes line to dry."

We never regarded their "theoretical deductions" as other than unsound, but such candid admission from themselves as to the usefulness of their theories is refreshing.

Having abandoned their theories the Communists were then free to get down to action. Mr. J. McHendrick, of Rutherglen,

obligingly tells us what kind of action.

It was arranged that the addressing of envelopes should be done by team work, and anyone who saw this work being done would have to admit that the Communist Party is a working party.

And to think that the Soviet Government borrows money at high rates of interest from Russian capitalists and then spends part of it paying British Communists to "help Ramsay Mac." at elections and address envelopes for Labour Party candidates!

THE MASS PARTY.

The justification given by the Communists for supporting MacDonald, whom they described as a "faithful servant of capital," was that this was the way to build up a "mass Communist Party."

In the "Communist Review," (October, 1929) the Tyneside District Party Committee publishes a statement on the condition of the Communist Party as a whole.

This is what they say:—

After ten years of strenuous effort, the Communist Party of Great Britain finds itself with a financial membership which cannot be placed at a higher figure than 2,500. It is doubtful if even this number of financial members would be found to exist were a careful examination made. Our Party has never been so weak in membership or influence.

The significance of this admission will be appreciated when it is remembered that the C.P.G.B. claimed to start with about 10,000 members and that, in addition to thousands of members who joined individually, it claimed to have won over in 1921 5,000 members of the I.L.P. en bloc.

It must indeed be disappointing to spend 10 years helping the Capitalist candidates against the Capitalist candidates, and addressing envelopes in Labour Party committee rooms and then find your membership smaller by three-quarters than when you began.

The stock Communist argument against using the vote as the means of gaining political control for the establishment of Socialism, is that the vote is a "Capitalist instrument," so that instead of using the vote for that purpose they hasten to use it to "help Ramsay Mac." administer Capitalism. The vote is a means of attaining power, and as such is neither Capitalist nor Socialist, but it is indeed useless to the workers under Communist guidance.

THE COMMUNIST STREET FIGHTERS.

We have often remarked on the danger to the working class of the Communist policy of street-fighting, that is, the pitting of practically unarmed men against the colossal weapons of modern warfare in the hands of trained soldiers.

At the Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, held at Leeds at the end of November, 1929, fresh evidence was given of the dangerously reactionary nature of Communist methods.

A special correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" reports a speech in which Mr. H. Pollitt, the prominent Communist and member of the Communist Party Executive, said:—

Only through social revolution, only through armed insurrection, can the workers gain power.
—("Manchester Guardian," 2nd Dec.)

In the "Workers' Life" (6th December) is a report of a speech delivered at the Congress by Mr. W. Gallacher, another prominent Communist, and also a member of the Central Committee. In it he said:—

They had talked of a Revolutionary Workers' Government, but did they realise what was implied? Would the organisation of the workers for the revolutionary government be a legal one? The task of fighting for a revolutionary government would be a task of bringing the workers out on to the streets against the armed forces of Capitalism.

Having assisted their friend "Ramsay Mac." into office and placed his Government in control of the armed forces, the Communists now talk of leading the workers into the streets against those same armed forces!

This sort of lunacy they call "tactics."

Last May Day in Berlin we had an example of this street fighting. Large numbers of young Communists "armed" with a few revolvers and one dummy machine-gun suffered heavy casualties at the hands of a fully-equipped, semi-military, police force.

Recently the same suicidal policy has been tried out again, also in Germany. On this occasion a number of Communists were killed and many were more or less seriously wounded by the police, who were armed with revolvers, machine-guns and armoured cars. (See "Manchester Guardian" and "Daily Express," 16th January.)

The Communists, according to the accounts in the two newspapers referred to above, were "armed" with a few revolvers,

plus "bricks," "stones," "planks" and "knuckle-dusters"!

We have only one comment to make. Whenever Pollitt and Gallacher intend throwing stones at a machine-gun or hitting a tank with knuckle-dusters we hope they will let us know so that we can be there to see.

ENTER THE PROLETARIAN PEASHOOTERS.

We are now unreliably informed of new developments in the Communist Party. According to this report that Party is now discussing a question which divided the military experts several hundreds of years ago. The question is that concerning the relative merits of the Crossbow and the Long bow. The old controversy was finally settled by the perfecting of firearms, it being found that both crossbowmen and long-bowmen were as good as dead against the gun.

The present dispute among the "street-fighters" is, however, in danger of being side-tracked by yet another school of thought which has on its side two unanswerable arguments. One is that it is possible for workers to die heroically and perfectly uselessly up against armed forces without going to the trouble of having either long-bows or cross-bows, dummy machine guns or knuckle-dusters; and the second is that the cheap and homely pea-shooter, while entirely useless, is a weapon which, unlike the vote, has not been besmirched by being used by the Capitalists. Hence the rumoured formation of an entirely new corps of "Proletarian Peashooters." Pollitt and Gallacher are to be in command of the new force, ably supported by three unemployed Baptist chaplains. P.S.

BATTERSEA**A MEETING**

will be held at

LATCHMERE ROAD BATHS
(The Waiting Room. Entrance in Burns Road)
on

Thursday, February 20th, 1930
at 8 p.m.

Speaker—**H. MILTON**

Subject—**"The Mining Situation"**

Questions and Discussion. Admission Free. All Invited

A LOOK ROUND.**THE LABOUR PARTY AND WAR.**

An idea which is widely held, although quite baseless, is that the Labour Party is an anti-war party. Many people have already forgotten that the Labour Party officially supported the war in 1914, engaged in recruiting, was represented in the Asquith Coalition Government by Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. Barnes, and Mr. Roberts, and in the Lloyd George Coalition by Mr. Henderson (member of the War Cabinet), Mr. John Hodge (Minister of Labour), and Mr. Barnes (Minister of Pensions). (See 1919 Labour Year Book, pages xii and xiv.)

It was Mr. Arthur Henderson who distinguished himself by urging the deportation of strikers from the Clyde, including Mr. David Kirkwood, now a Labour M.P.

It is, however, often argued that the Labour Party has learned by experience, and would not repeat the "mistake" of 1914. It is therefore worth while taking particular note of the actions and declarations of Mr. Arthur Henderson, Secretary of the Labour Party, and now Foreign Secretary in the Labour Government. In 1914 Mr. Henderson supported war. Has he admitted his error, or changed his attitude? Let Mr. Henderson speak for himself.

At the 1925 Labour Party Annual Conference, Mr. Henderson spoke on behalf of the Executive Committee in opposition to a resolution asking for disarmament. At that time the French Government's occupation of the Ruhr was still fresh in mind, and in certain circles, including the British Labour Party, feeling against France was running high. This is what Mr. Henderson said:—

If France continued in the frame of mind she was now in, had they to overlook the possibilities of defence? They could not afford to ignore this question of defence.

—(See Conference Report. Page 232.)

Then, in 1929, Mr. Henderson was challenged about his war-time activities, and replied in a statement to the "Daily Herald" (January 10th, 1929). In that statement Mr. Henderson said "he was not in the least ashamed of his war record, and was willing that it should be investigated by any committee appointed by the Labour Party."

Of course, Mr. Henderson was willing to have his war-time activities investigated by the Labour Party. How could his fellow jingoes find him guilty without condemning their own anti-working class activities?

It will be noticed that Mr. Henderson retracts nothing and apologises for nothing. In 1914 it was Germany; in 1925 it was France; who will it be next time Mr. Henderson wants the working class to go to war in defence of British Capitalism?

* * *

ARE THE MEN WORSE THAN THE WOMEN?

Mr. Henderson is ably supported by Miss Susan Lawrence, M.P., who is Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health. Speaking at Friends' House, Euston Road, on January 14th, on "Women and Peace," Miss Lawrence said:—

I think we must face the fact that under certain circumstances war is inevitable. I would go so far as to say that there are certain conditions which are worse than war... It is a horrible fact that there is no great nation in the world that has attained its freedom except by war.—("Manchester Guardian," 15th Jan.)

Unfortunately, Miss Lawrence did not let out two intriguing secrets. She omitted to say what were the conditions worse than war, and she forgot to say which was the nation in which the working class had attained their freedom. As she went on to say that the "memories of how we attained our freedom are proud memories," we are forced to conclude that the "we" who have attained freedom are not the working class at all. May we ask Miss Lawrence and the I.L.P., of which we understand she is a member, why we of the working class should go to war to maintain the freedom of the Capitalist class?

* * *

UNHAPPY MR. MAXTON.

Mr. James Maxton, Chairman of the I.L.P., has just been severely snubbed by the Scottish group of his party. At a delegate conference a resolution endorsing his recent attitude towards the Labour Government was rejected by 103 votes to 94, although the national executive supports him. In the course of his speech to the delegates, Mr. Maxton complained bitterly that the army of revolt which he thought he was leading, suddenly vanished into thin air. "You had shoved me up against the guns, and when I looked round there was

nobody there." (Reported in "Manchester Guardian," 13th and 14th January.)

Truly an unfortunate position to be in, but one which sooner or later always overtakes those who trade in bluff. Mr Maxton's army of revolt is composed of I.L.P. members of Parliament who owe their seats to Labour votes and Labour support. How can they then seriously oppose the Labour Party? And is Mr. Maxton himself an inspiring figure to lead revolts? He has yet to live down even among his own supporters the ghastly fiasco of the "Cook and Maxton" campaign. At the outset of that little firework display Mr. Maxton was neatly cornered on this very question of revolts.

He spoke to a crowded audience in St. Andrew's Hall, Glasgow, on Sunday, July 7th, 1928. (Reported in "Forward" on July 14th.) He was asked the following question:—

You have denounced Ramsay MacDonald. Are you prepared to advocate the expulsion of MacDonald from the Labour Party?

Here was a chance for Maxton to show a bold and logical front. But this was his reply:—

He was not prepared to advocate the expulsion of MacDonald. He did not believe in expelling anybody. He believed in having both Lefts and Rights in the Party where they could fight things out and let the Centre get on with the work. If people got expelled from the Party they got further away from the Party, and he believed in keeping them under control.

Here you have the bold, bad office boy who puts his fingers to his nose behind the boss's back, but "does not believe in sacking the boss because he wants to keep him under control."

It has been truly said of Mr. Maxton that he is "one of those people who mean well, but . . ."

* * * "WE BAND OF BROTHERS."

Mr. Maxton's idea of letting "Lefts" and "Rights" fight while the "Centre" gets on with the work, brings to mind another hoary old argument used by the I.L.P. against the Socialist Party, "Why not," they say, "let us all get together in the Labour Party and be one great, happy band of brothers all united for Socialism?"

The answer is that only Socialists can be united for Socialism, and the Labour Party and I.L.P. are neither Socialist nor united. Mr. Maxton and the majority of the National Administrative Council of the

I.L.P. are at daggers drawn with the minority and with the Scottish Group. Mr. Johnston, Mr. Wheatley, Mr. Dollan and others are carrying on a heated and abusive quarrel in the columns of "Forward," and the Editor of the "New Leader" boasts that he is holding the balance evenly between the two sides. Mrs. Mary Hamilton, an I.L.P. member of Parliament, writes in the "New Leader" (6th December) saying that the I.L.P. is not a class party, and Mr. David Kirkwood, another I.L.P. member of Parliament, replies (13th December) that it is a class party or ought to be if it isn't. A "branch secretary" of the I.L.P. writes as follows ("New Leader," 27th December):—

Once more a position has arisen in which the I.L.P. seems hopelessly lacking in unity. Speaking as a branch official who has served the Party as boy and man for 30 years, I say quite frankly that the situation cannot long continue. It is quite impossible to maintain any semblance of work locally whilst I.L.P.'ers in Parliament continue to talk from opposite positions.

"Branch secretary" is quite wrong in one respect. The I.L.P. from its birth has always had its members "talking from opposite positions," and have we not just quoted Mr. Maxton's statement that that is what he likes? That is a situation which will continue as long as workers can be found lacking Socialist knowledge, and consequently prepared to go on entrusting their thinking to leaders.

But we must confess that the horrible chaos existing inside the I.L.P. is hardly the kind of thing we want to be mixed up in. That is not what we call "unity for Socialism." H.

TOTTENHAM

A MEETING

will be held at
TOTTENHAM TRADES HALL
on

Sunday, February 16th
at 7.30 pm.

SPEAKER:

W. E. McHaffie.

SUBJECT:

"Our Case Against the Reformers"

All Invited
Questions and Discussion. Admission Free.

SHALL WE PRAISE THE LORD?

Who has not heard the above expression of religious devotion or first-class humbug? One is reminded of it, on a perusal of the "Star" for January 13th. It seems that there had been a suicide, and almost as usual, the suicide had been a member of the working class, for he lived not in Mayfair or Belgravia but Walworth. In saying good-bye to his parents in a note left behind, he specially refers to the cause of his action; he was out of work. Apparently he contemplated the difficulties of the struggle to live and decided that he had had enough. But in case you also read the report and arrived at the same conclusion as the writer, let me hasten to add that the brains of Capitalism as typified by the local coroner, thought otherwise. The mother "said that her son had been temporarily discharged from his work as motor driver because his car was being overhauled. He had a stretch of six months before, and it played on his mind. He was a very sensitive boy." The Coroner replied: "It is a shocking thing for a lad of 20 to commit suicide. Did you give him any religious instruction?"

"No, Sir."

The Coroner: "You are his mother and responsible for it. Why did you not give him religious instruction?"

The mother remained silent and this gave our worthy the opportunity to pile on the agony. "There you are, you see. This is the result." The result, you will observe, not of unemployment, oh dear no, but of the failure of his mother to give him religious instruction! One can, of course, imagine that had he received this instruction he would have resigned himself to "that position in life to which it had pleased God to call him." Although, given elementary education, our departed fellow-worker must have had his share of religion from 5 years to 14 years of age, if things haven't altered since the present writer was mal-educated by the L.C.G. It further transpired that our ex-wage-slave had double pneumonia at the time of his decease, in an acute stage, from which it may be supposed that he went to work with it; such is the struggle to live. He was to be taken back as soon as the car had been overhauled, so said a representative of the firm that had employed him.

A verdict was recorded of suicide while of

unsound mind, the real cause being inflammation of both lungs causing depression. Then our worthy coroner returned to the subject of religion.

If, however, we call the cause unemployment plus the physical state of deceased, we arrive at a verdict of death due to the Capitalist system of society.

Speaking of mentality, one is tempted to at least wonder at the state of the mentality of the official who could add to the agony of a woman who fairly obviously had had, by the loss of her son, more than enough. And if he thinks that any great number of young workers, when they get the sack, nowadays sing "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow," he is unaware of the attitude of young workers to-day.

J.B.

EAST LONDON.

A MEETING

Will be held at

Bromley Public Hall,

on

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 16th, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker:— E. LAKE.

Subject—

"The Outcome of the Class Struggle."

Questions and Discussion.

Admission Free.

All Invited.

Sunday Evening

MEETINGS

at 42 GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1
(near Borough Station Underground)

Speaker:

February 2nd A. JACOBS
Subject—General Strike and Political Action.

February 9th "GILMAC"
Subject—Dictatorship.

February 16th D. GOLDBERG
Subject—Socialism and the Living Wage.

February 23rd A. BEALES
Subject—Economic Causes of War.

All Invited.

Questions and Discussion

Admission Free.

Commence at 8 p.m.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

FEB.,



1930

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES.**PROGRESS IN AMERICA.**

Our readers will have read with pleasure that in November last comrades of ours in New York launched the first number of their monthly journal, "The Socialist." The founders, the Socialist Educational Society, are trying to link up into a national organisation a number of groups and individuals who have long carried on separately the work of propagating Socialism.

"The Socialist" will make it possible for them to get their message before a wider public with the object of turning what is now an educational society, with a declaration of principles based upon our own, into a political party.

The starting of the new journal is by no means an isolated event. It is the outcome of years of hard and often seemingly fruitless efforts. But the handful who persisted in that work were men who had learned by experience—some of them as members of the Socialist Party of Great Britain—that the road to Socialism cannot be an easy one. They know, as the founders of the S.P.G.B. knew, that there is no limit to the plausible but futile schemes for reforming Capitalism put forward by professional politicians and well-meaning but badly-informed would-be saviours of the working

class, and that nothing but Socialist knowledge will make the workers secure against these political frauds and cranks. The publication of "The Socialist" marks a definite step forward for the Socialist movement in the U.S.A., and it also inevitably means a heavy additional burden for the comrades who are responsible, a new drain on their time, their energies and their pockets. We urge our readers here and in America to give what aid they can in extending the sale of the new journal in order to lighten as much as possible the work of the Socialist Educational Society. We hope next to be able to report that the extension of their activities, the holding of more study classes and propaganda meetings, will have made it possible to form in the U.S.A. the looked-for Socialist Party.

AND AUSTRALIA.

Reference has also been made from time to time in our columns to the Socialist Party of Australia, another young organisation formed by a few readers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. They, too, have as their basis our Declaration of Principles.

At their meetings and lectures they have been in the habit of selling our pamphlets and the SOCIALIST STANDARD, but during the past year or two the Australian Government has done us the honour of banning our literature from that country. That action—still being continued under the present Labour Government which came into office last October—has caused us and our Australian comrades inconvenience and financial loss, but it is likely to have one very happy result. It has caused the Socialist Party of Australia to concentrate on publishing a journal of their own, and this they intend to do as soon as they can get together the necessary minimum of money. We commend this incident to the authorities who thought they could stop Australian workers from studying Socialism by excluding literature from abroad.

Readers in Australia who would like to assist in the work of the S.P. of Australia should get into touch with the Secretary, at P.O. Box 1440, Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION.

In the early days of the S.P.G.B. we sent delegates to the Congress of the International, but finding that parties were admitted to it which were prepared to re-

PARTY ACTIVITIES.**HEAD OFFICE.**

The Sunday evening lectures that were commenced at Head Office in the autumn have continued through the winter with considerable success. These lectures are given mainly by members who are developing as speakers, and this offers a splendid opportunity for beginners. The questions and discussion that follow have been usually on a high level and cannot fail to provide valuable information to those present.

We would like to see more members in attendance.

WEST HAM.**MEETING AT STRATFORD.**

In spite of very bad weather there was an interested audience of 250 at Stratford Town Hall on Sunday, January 12th, when our speaker dealt with the subject, "How to Get Socialism." Questions and opposition centred chiefly round the problem of doing something in order to check the worst effects of Capitalism. It was interesting to notice that even those who spoke in defence of the Labour Party policy were not prepared to speak enthusiastically about the Labour Government's actions. Instead of the usual Communist telling us that the workers must use armed force, the one Communist opponent who intervened did so in order to deny that the Communists hold any such view. Fortunately the speaker had available the report of the last Communist Congress where that policy was reiterated.

The members of the West Ham Branch who organised the meeting had used it as an opportunity of making the party more widely known. Some 3,000 handbills were given away and 1,000 specimen copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD were distributed prior to the meeting.

There was a collection of £2 6s. 9d., and literature was sold to the value of 9s. 4d.

EAST LONDON.

The East London Branch have been very active during the winter and are making good progress. Open-air propaganda in Victoria Park has been maintained and indoor public meetings have been held each month. In addition, the branch is conducting lectures in the branch room at 141,

pudiate by word and deed the fundamental principles of Socialism—parties here and abroad of the type of the Labour Party and the I.L.P.—we withdrew. We were not, and are not, prepared to associate internationally with organisations which are opposed to Socialism at home. In due course the war justified all our criticisms of the Second International. Not being based on Socialist principles and knowledge, it dissolved at the first shock into national groups anxious only to outdo each other in their ferocious jingoism and their demonstrations of loyalty to their respective sections of the Capitalist class.

The eventual formation of the Third (Communist) International has not solved the problem; rather has it confused it still more. It, like its rival, is prepared to admit organisations which are not in any sense of the word Socialist. It admits and supports bodies which are avowedly nationalist, interested primarily in helping one Capitalist country against another. It allows (or rather orders) its national parties to support Capitalist candidates at elections and advocates the suicidal policy of street-fighting. Its policy is dictated, not in the interests of the working class of the world, but in the interests of the developing Capitalist system in Russia striving for a place in the world scramble for markets.

The progress of Socialist organisation cannot be more advanced on the international than on the national plane. We look forward to the time when our work and the work of the bodies we have mentioned and other individuals and groups in English-speaking countries and in Austria and elsewhere, will bear fruit in a real International based not on illusions but on the solid foundation of Socialist knowledge and organisation.

ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT.

MR. E. WARD (LUTON). Letters sent to the address given have been returned marked "Unknown."

READ "THE SOCIALIST"

"The Socialist," organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.), is obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office. Price 3d. a copy, post free; or 3/6 a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

Bow Road, on alternate Fridays in the month.

Potential speakers have been discovered among new members, and are being given opportunities for training. Sales of literature are good.

* * *

BATTERSEA.

The monthly meetings run by the Battersea branch in their branch room at Latchmere Road Baths have been a great success. Attendance has been good and considerable interest taken in the party point of view. Open-air propaganda has been maintained on Clapham Common, except in very bad weather conditions.

* * *

SHEFFIELD.

A BRANCH FORMED.

Efforts to form a branch in Sheffield have met with success, and we are looking forward to early signs of propaganda activity in that neighbourhood. Those wishing to get in touch should communicate with E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road, Millhouses, Sheffield.

* * *

EDINBURGH.

Edinburgh members are trying, in spite of difficulties, to make the party known and get a branch going. Not the least of the difficulties is the bad weather, which frequently prevents open-air meetings. When the weather improves their efforts are likely to meet with success. Those wishing to lend a hand should communicate with D. Lamond, at 15, Barclay Place.

* * *

GENERAL PROPAGANDA.

Regular open-air propaganda stations are being well maintained. Glasgow especially has been showing good results.

As so much depends on the SOCIALIST STANDARD to link up the party with friends and sympathisers, and to keep our position before the public, members are urged to make special efforts to increase sales. One way of doing this, we would suggest, is to get subscribers for a period of one year (the cost is only 2s. 6d. per annum, post paid). If each member of the party made it his or her job to get only one or two subscribers annually, our sales would increase by leaps and bounds.

All shoulders to the wheel to forward the good work.

PROPAGANDA COMMITTEE.

THE RESULTS OF RATIONALISATION.

Karl Marx, in the opening statement of his chapter on "Machinery and Modern Industry" (Capital, Vol. I), quotes John Stuart Mill as follows:—"It is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being."

Marx's retort in a footnote, apart from his scientific analysis of this aspect of Capitalism, is:—

Mill should have said, "Of any human being not fed by other's labour," for without doubt machinery has greatly increased the number of well-to-do idlers.

Capitalist apologists are never tired of telling us to-day of the blessings and comforts that Capitalism has bestowed—but on whom?

Part of the work of Marx and Engels was devoted to showing that the main object of the introduction and use of machinery was to increase profits. Long before Capitalism it was possible for human labour power to produce more from nature's materials in a given time than was required to maintain the producers during that time. This gave rise to the surplus wealth upon which all forms of slavery have been founded. These slave societies have varied according to the particular form under which the wealth was produced and appropriated (chattel slavery, serfdom and wage slavery). The latter form is the one with which we are at present concerned; it is one in which the means of production (land, machinery, railways, etc.) take the form of investments of Capital, owned by the Capitalist class. They are the section in society owning property in the means of life, and that possession enables them to buy the labour power of the large remaining propertyless section, the working class. This labour power, the workers' only asset, when set in motion, produces, as in other slave systems, "a greater value" than it receives in return as wages. With the aid of power, machinery, science, etc., this greater or surplus value has been extended to proportions once undreamed of. The buyers of labour power, the Capitalists, are not concerned with production as such, their concern is primarily with the effective exploitation of the working class for profit.

This term, Capital, is unknown when applied to wealth prior to the present system.

Problems that confront the Capitalist class to-day are not those which confronted other ruling classes. Production cannot proceed uninterrupted unless markets can be found for the products, and, while these products are useless to the Capitalist personally, they contain the surplus or unpaid labour of his workers. The power to produce wealth grows by leaps and bounds, but the power of the workers to consume is limited to the fractional value of their output received as wages.

In this fact lies the secret of the epidemic of over-production, and, finally, of trade depression and stagnation which necessitates restricted output in most of the important industries to-day. Says Marx:—

The consuming power of the labourers is handicapped partly by the laws of wages, and partly by the fact that it can be exerted only so long as the labourer can be employed at a profit for the Capitalist class. The last cause of all real crises always remains the poverty and restricted consumption of the masses as compared to the tendency of Capitalist production to develop the productive forces in such a way that only the absolute power of consumption of the entire Society would be their limit.

—"Capital." Vol. III. Page 508.)

A favourite method, and one that used to be considered safe in refuting Marx's teaching regarding the relative worsening of the workers' conditions, was to look wise and repeat, "Look at America." Now the Economic League and the I.L.P. will have to construct fresh apologetics with which to defend themselves and with which to meet Socialist arguments. From the very country where we were told that mass output and high wages had banished poverty we now learn from the "Daily News" (14/1/30) in bold headlines that there are "Millions of workers scrapped by machines." Apparently not even the so-called high wages, nor the prodigal dissipation of wealth by thousands of millionaires, has prevented Capitalism taking the course predicted by Marx. The "Daily News" New York Correspondent says in the same issue:—"Unemployment in fact, despite the greatest prosperity boom in history, has become as in Great Britain with 1,500,000 workless—the greatest of all national problems." This correspondent estimates the unemployed figures at about four millions, but confesses these figures are "merely shots in the dark."

Previous reports from Capitalist sources (see SOCIALIST STANDARD, October, 1928)

would appear to make it a reasonable assumption that they actually underestimate. The causes of this huge displacement of workers are now, strangely, claimed to be the very things that were previously hailed as the means of American prosperity. They are declared to be "Improvement in machinery; the invention of labour-saving devices; the extension of cheap electric power; the process described in Great Britain under the name of Rationalisation." The latter is interesting news, especially as the day previous to this report Mr. Ben Tillett was reported in the "Daily Herald" as saying: "Our textile magnates appear to be either too poor or too inept to realise the virtues of scientific rationalising of industry and the scrapping of all obsolete plants and processes for the greater efficiency which modern methods and equipment are capable of providing" ("Daily Herald," 13/1/30). Practically the whole programme of "Labour and the Nation" aims at the same schemes of Rationalisation, or more efficient organisation of Capitalist production for profit. Without spending time and space on details of argument, any thinking and reasoning reader can see that if America is evidence, then it is not production that is at fault there or here. This fact also rules out such freakish reforms as Birth Control, Family Allowances, or a so-called Living Wage, as relief remedies within a system that reduces its producers to poverty and raises its parasites to millionaires. With a naive innocence that reeks of Nonconformist cant, the same "Daily News" Editorial, commenting on the American situation, says:—"It is a kind of nonsense to say that a process which makes the world richer must inevitably make thousands of individuals poorer." Really! is it? Have they never heard of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," Chiozza Money's "Riches and Poverty," Chas. Booth's "Darkest England," or the statements of Capitalist Prime Ministers like Gladstone, Campbell Bannerman, and Lloyd George? The Capitalist class cannot conceive of any other form of ownership of society's means of life than the private property basis of modern society. To them, abolition of the present form of wealth, ownership, Capital, means abolition of the means of production themselves.

The "Daily News" unable to explain away the glaring contradictions of Capital-

ism, increasing poverty, side by side with increasing wealth, refuses to reason and takes refuge in the statement that "it is a kind of nonsense." They even have to abandon the stock argument that these inconveniences are temporary, for their report says: "The theory that the workers thrown out of one occupation can find employment in others is not sustained by observation . . . for the first time in history there are indications that this compensatory process may have come to an end and that the trend of modern invention may be to make less work for idle hands instead of more."

Free-born Britons—note! Even in the same issue of the paper that considers the co-existent condition of poverty and superabundance, "A kind of nonsense" we read of 2,000,000 Chinese who have died of famine aggravated by the fuel and transport shortage. Millions of willing and able producers withdrawn from production, transport and transporters who could circle the earth with once undreamt-of rapidity, millions of unemployed willing to produce wealth and yet—famine and poverty. What stark madness! Such is Capitalism! No reform that could be introduced will prevent the present system from proceeding according to the laws of its own development. The effects of these laws we have briefly outlined. From the workers' point of view Capitalism renders all reform futile to solve the main poverty problem. Their conditions worsen faster than the reforms can be introduced and take effect.

The very advocacy of Reform presupposes the continuance of the present system whether those reforms are presented as the sugar-coated pills of the I.L.P. or the frothy catch-phrases of the so-called Communist. It is the Capitalist system itself that enslaves the Worker. The remedy is the removal of the cause and no "meantime" patchwork can do that. Only a Socialist Working Class will ever be able to undertake the removal of Capitalism and the establishment of common ownership of the means of life. Such ownership will place the powers and the results of production at the disposal of the whole of society; consequently leisure and comfort could be available for all if the Workers had the Knowledge and the desire to bring the change. Until then, through political ignorance, they will continue to keep in existence the present system.

MAC.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT. BANK LOANS AND DEPOSITS.

London, N.4.
10/1/30.

To the Editor of the
SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Sir,

As an old reader of the "S.S." may I be permitted to express disappointment at your treatment of Mr. Edwin Wright's contribution on the Gold Standard?

One feels that the point he raised requires greater consideration than it received at your hands.

His case is, as I understand it, that the actual deposits of cash received by banks is a negligible quantity relative to the total deposits as shown by their balance sheets, and that consequently we have to look for the bank's main source of revenue, not from a profit made as a result of the margin between deposit-rate and bank-rate, but from the fact that they are in a position to loan considerable sums in excess of the actual deposits upon which interest is paid.

It is true a bank does other work besides the granting of loans and overdrafts. The buying and selling of investments, discounting bills, etc., play a part in a bank's activities, and consequently the statement made by Mr. Walter Leaf, and quoted by you, is not an indictment of the theorem, "Every bank loan creates a deposit"; it merely points to a possibility, under certain conditions, of bank deposits and loans, and advances to vary inversely.

That the main proposition, however, as advanced by your correspondent, and so generally accepted in the Socialist and Labour movement, should have been rejected and subjected to scorn by you, is beyond comprehension.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM NICHOLLS.

REPLY.

Mr. Nicholls intervenes in order to explain what another correspondent meant when he wrote, "Every bank loan creates a deposit." Two things are possible: either Mr. Wright meant what he wrote or he meant something which he did not write. We, having no other evidence of Mr. Wright's meaning than his letter, took it for granted that he meant what he wrote and replied accordingly. (See January "S.S.") We quoted the reply given by the late Mr. Walter Leaf to the same proposition. It is, of course, possible that the person to whom Mr. Walter Leaf was replying also did not mean what he said but something else, but evidently Mr. Leaf felt about that just as we do.

Mr. Nicholls tells us that Mr. Walter Leaf's reply "is not an indictment of the theorem 'Every bank loan creates a deposit'; it merely points to a possibility,

under certain conditions, of bank deposits, and loans, and advances to vary inversely." May we remind Mr. Nicholls that the proposition put forward by Mr. Wright was not the proposition that "some bank loans, possibly, under certain conditions, create a deposit," but that "every bank loan creates a deposit." Mr. Walter Leaf gave a definite illustration of a £29 million increase of loans and advances being accompanied by a £25 million decrease in deposits. That meets the proposition put forward by Mr. Wright; it does not meet some other proposition which Mr. Nicholls says Mr. Wright meant to put forward. It was not intended to.

Now for Mr. Nicholls' own trouble. He thinks that Mr. Wright meant to say that

The actual deposits of cash received by banks is a negligible quantity relative to the total deposits shown . . . and that they (the banks) are in a position to loan considerable sums in excess of the actual deposits on which interest is paid.

The first part of the statement is not in dispute. The second part, even if it were true, has no direct bearing on the first part, although in Mr. Nicholls' letter they are joined by the word "consequently." In the first part he refers to "cash," while in the second part he refers to "actual deposits on which interest is paid," but these are not the same thing, the latter being a much larger sum than the former.

We notice that Mr. Nicholls only tells us what he thinks the banks "are in a position" to do. He does not commit himself to telling us that they do it. If he meant (but forgot to state) that they do in fact "loan considerable sums in excess of the actual deposits on which interest is paid," we shall be pleased to see his evidence for that assertion.

Mr. Nicholls wants us to accept his unsupported assertion without any evidence whatever, except another assertion (itself untrue) that in the "Labour and Socialist Movement" (by which we presume he means the Labour Party and its affiliated bodies) this view is "generally accepted." Even if the Labour Party were agreed on this question instead of being divided as on most questions, it is indeed a novel doctrine that the Socialist Party ought to accept Mr. Nicholls' errors because those errors have been endorsed by a number of non-Socialist organisations. We cannot even promise Mr. Nicholls not to disagree

with them again, though this may cause him still more surprise.

Knowing the usual fate of people who intervene in other people's quarrels, we are now expecting to hear from Mr. Wright that his letter meant what it said, or at any rate, not what Mr. Nicholls says it was intended to mean, and that Mr. Nicholls' letter is itself in need of inspired interpretation.
Ed., Comm.

TUGAN-BARANOWSKY'S CRITICISM OF MARX.

"Modern Socialism in its Historical Development," by M. Tugan-Baranowsky, was published in 1910. It was translated from the Russian by M. I. Redmount.

The most interesting feature of the work is the record of working-class efforts and ideas in the early days of the movement. The phrasing is inclined to be awkward, possibly due to difficulties of translation. It is, in places, not easy to get at the ideas. When understood, however, the work presents a rather curious instance of an author losing sight of his own premises, merely because society has failed to act on them.

On page 14 he defines Socialism as

The social organization in which, owing to equal obligations and equal rights of all to participate in the communal work, as also owing to the equal right to participate in the produce of this work, the exploitation of one member of the community by another is impossible.

Having laid this down as a working principle—incomplete as it is—the reader might expect that it would, at least, be used to show wherein working-class parties, calling themselves Socialist failed to act up to their name. Instead, M. Baranowsky, confusing labour politics with what he calls Marxism, declares that the latter has departed from its principles. By Marxism he means the principles that should govern the workers in their efforts to emancipate themselves. These principles were broadly outlined by Karl Marx in the Communist Manifesto.

On page 8 M. Baranowsky says that Socialists recognised that they had to bear in mind the immediate needs of the people and shape their policy on them. In consequence of these ingenious Marxian tactics, he says, Socialism has become the greatest political power of the present. He describes this action as transferring the centre of gravity of the Socialist movement into

the sphere of practical politics. The ultimate aim, he says, recedes into the background, whilst the proper ideal continues to serve but as a symbol, without any concrete content, and finally, the tactics of Marxism have in theory resulted in weakening the interest in the final issue of Socialism.

Here, he fails to see that it is the Labour Party that has falsified Socialist principles by their reformist policy. The broad facts of the working-class position, and the principles drawn from them are, in essence, the same to-day as when Marx outlined them in the Communist Manifesto. M. Baranowsky should, reasoning from his declared facts, have noted that the Labour Party cannot, at the same time, be both a reformist and a Socialist party.

This failure to see that a Socialist party must have Socialist principles, and base its political activities on them, vitiates the work throughout. To M. Baranowsky the Labour Party is a Socialist party in spite of its reformist policy and its denial of Socialist principle.

The reason for his shortsightedness is seen after a careful examination of his book. M. Baranowsky has the Utopian mind. Something of the soundness of the Socialist position he glimpses here and there; but in the main he belongs to the period of which he writes most fluently; the period when reformers like Owen, Fourier and St. Simon saw the rottenness of Capitalism and planned new systems to supplant it. In his preface he compares these with Marx, as follows:—

And taking into consideration that Marxism, as I strongly believe, does not embrace all the scientific elements of Socialism, my investigation necessarily assumed an historical character in so far as I was obliged to retrospect and introduce earlier, partly forgotten doctrines of the so-called Utopian category, which I consider deserving of the most serious attention and which in some respects are even more scientific than Marxism.

One of the best-known of the Utopians was Fourier. His plan for the reformation of society was the formation of groups, called Phalanstries, each group to settle on the land and provide for themselves by their associated labour. Fourier himself waited in vain for some charitable millionaire to finance his first group. Yet there have been quite a number of these experiments in different parts of the world. They were

all failures. Capitalist society is too strong an organism to be affected by such dream-like projects.

Wherein can such schemes be termed scientific? M. Baranowsky does not tell us. But Marxism, as he calls it, can tell us why they always failed. Working-men cannot throw up their jobs and form groups to produce for themselves. They have no capital to start with (a necessity under Capitalism) and Capitalists already own the land.

But the Utopians are unscientific in another respect. They say that nothing can be achieved by struggling against those in power. The only effective weapon is persuasion. They turn their backs on the class struggle, instead of recognising it and taking their place in the ranks of the workers. What could be more unscientific than refusing to see what is so evident in modern society. The antagonism between Capitalists and workers is the most outstanding feature of modern times, all over the Capitalist world, and conditions cannot essentially change for the working-class until they get the upper hand in that struggle.

But it is not the early Utopian ideas with which M. Baranowsky is chiefly obsessed. His Utopianism has advanced somewhat. Sixty pages are devoted to what he conceives as the special forms that the future society may take. He reviews the possibilities of eight different systems. Socialism and Communism have each four alternative arrangements, according to him: Centralized, Corporate, Federal and Anarchical. The Utopian cast of his mind is plainly revealed in the profitless task of reviewing these forms. But even more so is this the case in the last section of his book, where he says on page 230:—

In the Socialist community, just so as in the Capitalistic, the price of a commodity will rise in the case of demand exceeding supply, and fall in the inverse instance.

In this quotation we see how Capitalist ideas clog the minds of those who try to frame schemes to escape from the evils of the present system. M. Baranowsky would carry over into a future system he has somehow conjured up, the very things that make Capitalism what it is. He would still have commodities and commodity production. Sale and purchase of the necessities of life.

Capitalism is based on the class ownership of the means of wealth production and the commodity character of human labour-power. Labour-power is bought by the Capitalists to operate the machinery of production and sell their commodities on the world's market. The energy of the worker is a commodity, he is stamped with the commodity character. He is compelled to suffer all the vicissitudes that distinguish other commodities in the Capitalist world: over-supply, depreciation and physical decay, when he can no longer sell his one commodity.

Throughout the productive and commercial world everything has a practical aim in view. The object of it all is profit. The workers themselves cultivate efficiency, eliminate waste, produce all forms of wealth, and run all the services that minister to the world's needs. Yet they suffer poverty because they do all this for those who buy their energy. Everywhere business is run on practical lines and becoming more rationalised every day. Yet the worker's mind is still obsessed with the false notion that wealth can only be produced by this arrangement that makes the bulk of human society—the working-class—a class of wage-slaves.

Production and distribution of wealth can be carried on by society without the enslavement of one class. But only the class that is enslaved can possibly want such a system. Consequently, it can only be established by the workers themselves. Moreover, it can only be established in opposition to the Capitalist class. Which means that the workers' first task is to critically examine and understand the basis of Capitalism. He will then know for himself what must be changed or eliminated in order that he and his class may win security and freedom from exploitation.

F.F.

SHEFFIELD.

A MEETING

Will be held in the
A. E. U. INSTITUTE (Library), STANLEY ST.,
on
Tuesday, 18th February, at 7.30 p.m.

All Invited

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

A LABOUR PARTY PROMISE AND A CAPITALIST ADMISSION.

Mr. Tom Shaw, speaking at Wandsworth on December 16th, 1929, gave the following interesting pledge on behalf of the Labour Party:—

We make no apology for saying that the instant we are powerful enough to do it, poverty shall be abolished.

—("Evening News," 17th Dec.)

The "Evening News," in an editorial, expressed its doubts about the matter:—

That is not the maundering of a street-corner spell-binder. It is the considered utterance of Mr. Tom Shaw, one of His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State in the Labour Government and incidentally the man who once complained piteously that he could not produce a remedy for unemployment "like rabbits out of a hat."

We make no apology for saying that though Mr. Shaw and his friends should be returned to Parliament with no opposition at all poverty will not be abolished. We venture to add that the type of mind that could produce such a statement as Mr. Shaw made at Wandsworth last night will never decrease poverty, let alone abolish it.

We are strongly of the opinion that the "Evening News" is right; we also do not think that the Labour Party will succeed in fulfilling Mr. Shaw's promise. We are quite certain that poverty will not, and cannot, be abolished under Capitalism, although the administration of the system is in the hands of "Labour" men. But what surprises us is the further admission of the "Evening News" that the problem has not been solved in the U.S.A., which the "Evening News" is always telling us to imitate.

We might begin by reminding Mr. Shaw that the world has never been without poverty and that in the United States to-day, the richest nation in material wealth that the world has ever known, there is plenty of it—not relative poverty merely, but want and destitution.

Next time we are invited to copy American methods, perhaps the "Evening News" will tell us in what way "want and destitution in the U.S.A. are preferable to "want and destitution" in the United Kingdom."

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sunday ... Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1 8 p.m.
... Clapham Common, 11 a.m.
... Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
... Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Wednesdays ... Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
... Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.
Sundays ... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
... Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
GLASGOW BRANCH.
Sundays ... West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA**.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE**.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM**.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CENTRAL**.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- EAST LONDON**.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW**.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.
- HACKNEY**.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 2nd and 4th Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY**.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.
- SLINGTON**.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Sec., A. Baker, 18, Orpingley Road, N.7.
- LEYTON**.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER**.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON**.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).
- SHEFFIELD**.—Branch meets Thursdays 8 p.m. at 44, Edgedale Road. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA**.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- SOUTHWARK**.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- TOOTING**.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM**.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW**.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD**.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.
- WEST HAM**.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 307. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE FALLACY OF EMPIRE FREE TRADE.

Lords Rothermere and Beaverbrook, who six months ago were waging a fierce "circulation war" in their rival group of newspapers, have buried the hatchet in order to launch the United Empire Party—the "Party of Prosperity." The idea underlying the programme of the new party is simple enough. The British Empire is to become one unit for trade purposes against the rest of the world. Any article which can be grown or manufactured inside one or other of the Empire countries is to be grown there and freely imported into other Empire countries. Foreign productions are to be kept out by means of protective tariffs. America is to be the model, and prosperity is to be the result. Viscount Rothermere writing in the *Sunday Dispatch* on February 23rd, tells us that five years after the achievement of Empire Free Trade "Great Britain will be as prosperous as the United States." The party is described as "not political, but economic. It will include men and women of all political views. Conservatives, Liberals, and Labourites alike will be welcome to it." (Viscount Rothermere, in the *Daily Mail*, 19th February). This "non-political" party is, however, going to run a large number of candidates for Parliament, to secure the application of its programme. Lord Beaverbrook is the leader of the new party, and Viscount Rothermere his right hand man.

"ALL SENSIBLE PERSONS."

The U.E.P. has met with a heavy fire of criticism from the older parties, but almost all of the critics agree in endorsing the

notion that "prosperity" would result from improved trade. They condemn the scheme only because they believe it to be impracticable for the purpose it has in view. As the *New Statesman* puts it, "all sensible persons wish to see an expansion of trade between Empire countries." A glance at the last general election programmes of the political parties will show that they all believe in improved trade. Mr. Baldwin backed "safeguarding" as the means of doing this. Mr. Lloyd George preferred the Trade Facilities Act, which gives "the support of the national credit to industrial enterprises." The Labour Party shared Lloyd George's view; "A Labour Government will set to work at once by using Export Credits and Trade Facilities Guarantees, to stimulate the depressed export trades." Finally the Communists urged the development of trade with Russia. Only the Socialist Party dissents from the view of the *New Statesman's* "all sensible persons." We do not want "free trade" or "protection" but Socialism, which means "no trade." Trade, whether local trade, Empire trade or International trade, means the buying and selling of goods which are privately owned by the owners of the means of production. Socialism, which means the production of goods for use and not for sale, will end buying and selling.

That is a question of the organisation of production and distribution on a Socialist basis, and it may be asked what is our attitude to the problem of trade as it exists under capitalism. Our attitude on this too, is essentially different from that of the parties mentioned.

"PROSPERITY" FOR WHOM?

We deny that improved trade offers any solution for the problems of the working class. Each of the parties of capitalism accepts the view that greater efficiency in British industry would enable British manufacturers to produce more cheaply and thus beat their foreign competitors. The argument is based on a childish fallacy which every elementary student of logic has met in the following little poser. In an examination set to a class of 30 boys, no boy was more than 5 marks from the boy above him on the list. Any boy would therefore be raised one place higher if he had 10 more marks. Is it then true to say that all the boys would be one place higher if they all had 10 more marks? The "improved trade" argument is just as silly. It is doubtless true that if "John Bull's" manufactures were reduced in price he would capture some markets from "Uncle Sam" or "Old Fritz"—provided that "Uncle Sam" and "Old Fritz" and the rest of the capitalist world consent to stand still. But they don't consent to stand still. In a competitive world an increase in the efficiency of each competitor leaves all the competitors where they were. A ten per cent. reduction in prices all over the world through the application of similar methods of rationalisation, leaves the least efficient capitalist nation still at the bottom of the class and still desperately trying to outstrip the others.

Viscount Rothermere tells us to copy America and then in five years we shall be "as prosperous" as America is. But how prosperous are the American workers? Has poverty been abolished in the U.S.A.? Viscount Rothermere's newspaper, the *Evening News*, told us as recently as December 17th, 1929, that "the world has never been without poverty and that in the U.S.A. to-day, the richest nation in material wealth that the world has ever known, there is plenty of it—not relative poverty merely, but want and destitution."

THE CAUSE OF "BAD TRADE."

Before joining the party of "want and destitution," stop and consider why "bad trade" and unemployment exist. The newspaper Lords are looking for the cause at the furthest end of the Empire; Mr. J. H. Thomas recently went seeking it in Canada; the Labour Party and the Communists fancy they have found it (or part of it) in the failure

to be on good trade relations with Moscow. The real cause lies nearer home, in the organisation of capitalism itself. In the U.S.A. there are over 33,000 people with incomes of 50,000 dollars or more, say upwards of £200 a week. In this country there are more than 9,000 people in the same happy position. They represent the wealthiest section of the capitalist class, but between them and the average worker with his wage of £2 or £3 per week (when he is in work), there are a few million wealthy people who between them get nearly half the total national income. Many of them have so much more than they need that they cannot and do not spend it. It must be as difficult to get through £200 a week as it was for the proverbial rich man in the Bible story to get into heaven, or the camel to get through the eye of a needle. The constant relative over-production of goods, the inability to find buyers, is due to the inequality of wealth which is part and parcel of Capitalism. So great is the wealth of the rich minority that all the stupendous and alluring advertising campaigns fail to induce them to spend up to the limit of their income or anything approaching the limit. The cost of building useless battleships, donations to charity, taxation to provide relief for the destitute, and pensions for the aged, all these forms of voluntary or obligatory expenditure leave the problem hardly touched. The wealth of the rich, their ownership and control of our means of life, this is the cause of poverty and unemployment. None of the "improved trade" parties can solve the problem. Workers who desert the Liberal, Tory, Labour and Communist Parties to join the new party are merely exchanging one illusory hope for another. Socialism will solve the problem of the poverty of the many by abolishing a system of society based upon the ownership of the means of production by the wealthy few; it will solve the problem of unemployment by abolishing the classes of employers and employed; it will solve the problems of competitive trade by abolishing trade.

H.

WANTED: A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*.

Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months.

THE PARIS COMMUNE.

We cannot let March pass away without a reference to an event of great significance in the history of the Working Class Movement. We refer to the Paris Commune of 1871.

Although nearly sixty years have passed away since the Commune, yet it still has a message for us, a message of hope and a message of warning. Then for the first time a section of the French working class, owing to a set of favourable circumstances, obtained control of supreme power and held it for a period of three months. Their defeat was due to many causes, chief of which were the unity of the International capitalists against them and the as yet unreadiness of the French working class for a social change in their interests.

The story of the Commune is told by Karl Marx in his little book, "The Civil War in France," and also by Lissagary (himself a fighter in the Commune) in his "Paris Commune of 1871."

Of the objects of the Commune Marx speaks as follows:

The whole of the educational institutions were opened to the people gratuitously, and at the same time cleared of all interference of Church and State.

All public servants (including magistrates and judges) were to be elective, responsible and revocable.

The Paris Commune was to serve as a model to all the great industrial centres of France.

The Rural Communes of every district were to administer their common affairs by an assembly of delegates in the central town, and these district assemblies were again to send delegations to the National Delegation in Paris, each delegate to be at any time revocable and bound by the formal instruction of his constituents. The few but important functions which still would remain for a Central Government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by Communal, and therefore strictly responsible, agents.

Engels in his introduction to the German edition of "The Civil War in France," points out that the members of the Commune were divided into a majority of Blanquists, who had also predominated on the Central Committee of the National Guard, and a minority, which consisted

for most part of members of the International Working Men's Association, who were followers of Proudhon. He then shows that both the Blanquists and Proudhonists did the reverse of that which the doctrines of their Schools prescribed. Of the Blanquists he writes as follows:—

The Blanquists fared no better. Brought up in the School of Conspiracy, held together by the rigid discipline essential to it, they started from the conception that a comparatively small number of resolute, well-organised men would be able not only to grasp the helm of State at a favourable moment, but also, through the display of great energy and reckless daring, to hold it as long as required; that is, until they had succeeded in carrying the masses of the people into the revolutionary current, and ranging them around the small leading band. To accomplish this, what was necessary, above all else, was the most stringent dictatorial centralisation of all power in the hands of the new revolutionary Government. And what did the Commune do—which in the majority consisted of these very Blanquists? In all its proclamations to the French people in the Provinces, it called upon them for a free federation of all French communes with Paris, for a National Organisation, which for the first time was to be the real creation of the nation. The Army, the Political Police, the Bureaucracy, all those agencies of oppression in a centralised government, which Napoleon had created in 1798, and which since then every new government had gladly used and kept up as ready weapons against its enemies, were to be abolished everywhere as they had been abolished in Paris. (Page 16.)

Lissagary gives a picture of Paris during the reign of the Commune which is instructive and interesting:—

Sunday the 26th was a day of joy and sunshine. Paris breathed again, happy, like one just escaped from death or great peril. At Versailles the streets looked gloomy, gendarmes occupied the station, brutally demanded passports, confiscated all the journals of Paris, and at the slightest expression of sympathy for the town arrested you. At Paris everybody could enter freely. The streets swarmed with people, the cafés were noisy; the same lad cried out the "Paris Journal" and the "Commune." The attacks against the Hotel-de-Ville, the protestations of a few malcontents, were posted on the walls by the side of the placards of the Central Committee. The people were without anger because without fear. The voting paper had replaced the Chassepot. (Page 127.)

In the course of the Commune, working men demonstrated their capacity to organise. The departments of the Mint, Finances, Education, Labour and Post Office were in charge of working men, and the results accomplished in the short space of time at their disposal was remarkable and many were continued after the suppression of the Commune.

But the people were not ready for such a fundamental change, and the forces without were too strong. The French Capitalists had made an arrangement with Bismarck under which one of the first stipulations was the pacification of Paris, and accordingly Bismarck released the captured French troops, who were let loose upon Paris by the Versailles government. The Communards contested with unsurpassed bravery and devotion every foot of ground and resisted for several days after the gates of Paris had been opened by treachery, and bitter was the toll they paid for the rising. The savagery of the government troops, as illustrated by Lissagary are almost unbelievable and even called forth comment from such a conservative paper as the *English Times*.

Lissagary records that about 20,000 were killed, while the number of the wounded will never be known. More than 40,000 prisoners were taken and trials followed lasting several years. 13,221 men, 157 women and 62 children were condemned. 270 were condemned to death and 7,500 to transportation.

Such was the vengeance wreaked by the French ruling class for an insurrection that failed. It will be well for the working class to remember the Commune and profit by its lessons. GILMAC.

EAST LONDON.

LECTURES

will be given at

141 BOW ROAD, E.3

FRIDAY, MARCH 7th

Speaker - J. W. Strickett

Subject—"Could a Minority Establish Socialism?"

AND

FRIDAY, MARCH 21st

Speaker - W. E. McHaffie

Subject—"Socialism and Religion."

All Invited. Admission Free.
Questions and Discussion. Commence 8 p.m.

SHEFFIELD

A MEETING.

will be held in the

A. E. U. INSTITUTE (Library), STANLEY ST.,
Friday, March 14th, at 7.30 p.m.

Speaker—E. BODEN

Subject—"Some Communist Fallacies."

All Invited.

Admission Free. Questions and Discussion.

GROAN WITH THE BISHOP.

Bishops are such poor fish; it seems a shame to hurt them. Their job is hard enough already, convincing their thinning flocks of the blessedness of short commons, whilst dallying themselves with the cursedness of plenty. Formerly, when their palsied logic was reinforced with the rack, the thumb screw and the stake, they were formidable enough, but their day has passed, and their excursions into publicity are more humdrum. So long as their pearls of wisdom are cast before their dumb and docile congregations, or scattered in the dry leaves of their parish magazines, little harm is done. They may be left to peter out painlessly in the dank, gloomy caves where they hide from science. Their brief excursions into the open are unfortunate. We remember with amusement their recent controversy over their book of petrified prayers. One had to mingle amusement with amazement at the spectacle of holy bishops quarrelling over the question as to whether pieces of bread, "blessed" by a priest, could remain sacred if stored in a cupboard. One remembers former controversies and activities. Their opposition to elementary education unless it included their superstitions; their opposition to a widower marrying the sister of his dead wife; their incitements to murder in the recent Great War.

They are engaged, as we have said, in a difficult task, and the day rapidly approaches when they will be forced to do something useful for a living. They realise that in the competitive world they have so lauded, their chances of as cushy a job again, are remote. One gloomy and reverend brother has taken time by the forelock, and makes money by contributing two columns of christian thought weekly, to one of our bright evening news sheets. When the crash comes, and the Church goes into liquidation, he should be certain of a job on the *News of the World*. Unlike the scriptures, his writings are copyright in all countries.

But to revert. The *Daily News* espied a sparkling gem of clerical thought in the Bishop of Gloucester's diocesan letter for January. Says the Bishop:—

A combination of sentiment and the influence of trade unions has steadily aimed at keeping wages above their economic level. The only results of that can mean that a large number of persons are unemployed. [Horrible English, but it is the Bishop's.] Until that is corrected unemployment will go on, but apparently it is un-

Christian to say that a person should give wages in accordance with the money that he has at his control. If a man is employing four workmen and giving each of them £1 a week, it will cost him £200 a year. If he is told that he must give each of them £2 a week, there are two alternatives. The one is he can throw up business and throw all out of work; the other is to pay two of them £2 a week, and throw two out of work: but the probable result will be that his business will fail and all four will be thrown out of work.

I like these simple illustrations, don't you? They are so easily grasped, even by the meanest intellect. They are so clear, so luminous, so self-evident, so — well, what is the use of all these terms like gold standards, and socialisation, after all? What we want is simplicity. One employer and four men; everyone can grasp that position. Four men work, one man pays them each £1, out of his scanty pocket, and then they go home. Having spent their substance in riotous living, they listen to a combination of sentiment and trade unionism, and straightway go unto the one man and demand of him £2 each. The Bishop sees but two alternative courses; either he should satisfy the clamour of two of them, and tell the others to go hang, or he shall throw up the business and tell them all to go hang. It is a pity the ecclesiastic vision could discern but two courses. For, having thrown up the business, what is he to do now? Having no business he will be in the same boat as the four. And then again, how far is the process to go. Are all the other employers who so kindly give £2 a week to their workmen to follow his example and throw up their businesses when asked for more? There is another course open too. If the employer in the illustration went to the same school of economics as the Bishop, he could take an enlightened view and at one fell swoop, solve the unemployment problem. He could reduce their wages to 5/- a week and take on twelve more men. They would object, you will say! Simple. The Bishop would beg a ride from some friendly carman, and fortified by his frugal bread and cheese, would go to them and explain the simple elements of his economic system to them. Being at bottom, sensible men, and impressed by the spectacle of dignified penury before them, they would throw their sentiment into the adjacent gutter, and break their trade unions across their knees, and thus would dawn a new era. There would be no unemployment, for the appearance

of any man asking for a job, would only be the excuse for a little sum in simple division. When I come to think of it, the whole poverty problem would be solved too. For poverty, after all, is only a relative condition. If everyone were getting the same sum, big or little, the term poverty would cease to serve any useful purpose. So you will see there is more in the Bishop's clear reasoning and simple illustration than one might think. And yet some people grudge them their £15,000 a year.

W. T. H.

COMRADE SEECH.

Will Comrade Seech communicate with Hackney Branch.

HACKNEY

LECTURES

will be given at the

ARCADIAN CAFE,
42 Amhurst Road, Hackney Station,

ON

MONDAY, MARCH 10th,

Subject—"The Basic Principles of Marxism."

Speaker—W. HOWARD.

AND

MONDAY, MARCH 24th.

Subject—

"The Uselessness of the Labour Party in Office."

Speaker—D. GOLDBERG.

Admission Free. All Invited.
Questions and Discussion. Commence 8 p.m.

Sunday Evening

MEETINGS

at 42 GREAT DOVER STREET, S.E.1
(near Borough Underground Station)

March 2nd Speakers:
Subject—How we are Governed. G. SHEERS
March 9th J. STRICKETT
Subject—Must we Convert the Majority.
March 16th W. HOWARD
Subject—The Paris Commune and its Lessons.
March 23rd J. BUTLER
Subject—What Socialism Means to the Workers.
March 30th H. WAITE
Subject to be announced.

All Invited. Admission Free.
Questions and Discussion. Commence at 8 p.m.

SOCIALISM AND THE ECONOMIC "EXPERTS."

Many people to whom Socialist teachings seem unanswerable and in every way satisfactory, are still reluctant to accept the Socialist case because they cannot believe that Capitalist theories can be unsound and yet be accepted by so many clever men, economists, financial and industrial experts, professors, scientists, and so on. They ask us how we can be so confident that we are right when so many apparently great economists say that we are wrong.

Our answer is two-fold. We claim in the first place that the only final test of a theory is that it should explain the facts and not be out of keeping with the facts. So, for example, we can quite confidently assert that the various theories which try to prove that permanent unemployment is impossible are shown to be wrong by the facts of permanent unemployment. Secondly, we ask you to remember that great reputations can be, to a large extent, created out of very little substance and that universities and such places, being dependent on the financial support of Capitalist Governments, wealthy companies, etc., do not shower honours on and give prominent posts to men whose ideas clash violently with the accepted ideas of Capitalism.

When we come to examine the theories of the learned men with whom we are especially concerned, the economists, we find that there are one or two facts which alone should justify the abandonment of that attitude of worshipping their declarations as if they were above criticism. Firstly, we observe that these "great" men rarely agree among themselves; secondly, their inability to give useful advice in practical problems is notorious; and thirdly, they themselves on occasion admit the unsatisfactory nature of their whole body of doctrines.

We give below two quotations which illustrate these points. The first is taken from a review, published in the *New Statesman*, of a recent book by Professor Edwin Cannan, who is one of the most famous of living economists. The book is his "Review of Economic Theory." The reviewer calls Professor Cannan the "Economic Socrates," and says:—

Let no one, then, go to this Review of Economic Theory in the hope of discovering in it new truth of a positive sort. It may help readers to new truth, but only indirectly, through the exposure of old error. This, however, it

achieves with signal success. Professor Cannan has no difficulty at all in proving his case that economic theory has been throughout its life, and is still, in a state of deplorable confusion, and that not only do the text-books talk a great deal of utter nonsense, but even the classical practitioners of the art or science are in a terribly muddled condition. His handling of Marshall is as devastating as his handling of Mill; and his comments on Marshall's living disciples are mostly to the effect that they have made the confusion worse. This is a real service; for economics stand in real need of an iconoclast, and an economic Socrates may well be the indispensable forerunner of an economic Plato. (*The New Statesman*, Oct. 19, 1929.)

Our next quotation is taken from "The Founders of Political Economy," by Jan St. Lewinski, D.Ec.Sc., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Lublin, Poland. The book was published in 1922 by P. S. King & Son, Ltd. :—

The Great War has clearly shown of what little use all our economic knowledge has been where most simple theoretical problems had to be solved. When, for instance, the question is after the war the rate of interest will be high or low became acute, writers began to discuss what capital really is, and each gave a different definition and different solutions of the problem. In Germany economic writers of high standing, as, for instance, the Vice-Chancellor and former Professor of Political Economy at the University of Berlin, Helfferich, claimed that Germany can wage war indefinitely because "money remains in the country." They imagined that money expended in financing military operations would return in form of war loans, and that this circle could last for centuries. Almost all economists in Germany believed in the truth of this absurd doctrine, and only the University of Breslau, which was a little doubtful about it, organised an inquiry on the subject.

All the rich economic literature which had been accumulating for more than a century could not afford a solution of a problem which really belongs to the A B C of our science. Could anything illustrate better the deplorable state of political economy? (Page 167.)

The next time somebody tells you that Socialist theory must be unsound because this or the other professor of economics says so, you may reflect that the views of these gentlemen on the subject of Socialism would carry more weight if they had first succeeded in reducing to order the chaotic jumble of theories which make up their own department of study.

H.

CORRECTION.

The reference to Chas. Booth's "Darkest England" in the article "Results of Rationalization" in the February *Socialist Standard*, should have read Chas. Booth's "Life and Labour."

ED. COMM.

LIFE AND LAUGHTER.

Beauty lies in the eye of the beholder, and so does humour. For instance: Magistrate (at Willesden, of course): "What is your occupation?"

Prisoner: "Unemployment!"

This was selected by the newspapers as a police court joke. So it is, but there is more humour than meets the eye. Another magistrate: "What is your occupation?"

Prisoner (or should we say defendant here): "I am a gentleman." No! there is no laughter here, not even a smile.

Here is a Labour Government in the seats of the mighty, pledged to abolish unemployment. They are not a sad-eyed, melancholy party. Jollity oozes from their joints and mirth gushes from their mouths. How they laughed when the Liberals said they would reduce unemployment to normal (whatever that is) in a twelvemonth. How the unemployed must laugh at this date, to think what the Labour Party has done for them. Mr. Thomas has been to Canada and several dinners, Mr. MacDonald has been to America and several luncheons, Mr. Snowden has been to Paris and several tea-fights, and Mr. Henderson has been to the Hague. And they all wear optimistic tall hats.

After all, life is very jolly, isn't it? Look at jolly old George Lansbury. He is papering the parlour with photographs from the papers, showing him at school treats, and looking at sites for Lidos, and sites for tarpaulin doss-houses, and considering other solutions of the poverty problem. There is no need for gloom, or despondency. Sir Oliver Lodge is helping. He has withdrawn his gaze from the interstellar spaces, and comes down to earth with jovial George. We believe this is the first occasion when a learned man of stifling profundity has collaborated with a real, red, one hundred per cent., out-and-out, raging, tearing revolutionary.

Such a jolly idea, too. The proposal is that those of our fellows who cannot find a master, and in consequence have no home, shall be allowed to pass the hours of darkness in the public parks. The possibility of rain is provided for by the intervention of a tarpaulin sheet between the homeless and heaven. You see how practical they are. Something now, that is the idea. None of your waiting until everybody votes for socialism. Free doss-houses in our time

or in our parks, everyone can appreciate that.

But really, if it wasn't for humour, where should we be? Someone suggested the other day that if we all wore our shirt tails six inches longer, we should abolish depressions in Lancashire. Of course, as usual, people thought it was a joke. You wait till George, the practical revolutionary, sees the idea. He and Sir Oliver ought to do something between them.

While we are on the subject of humour, it may be news to you that the recent great war was one long side-splitting joke. Books like "All Quiet on the Western Front," "Undertones of War," "Good-bye to all That," and so on, filled as they were with blood, brains and mangled bodies, lice, filth, disease, and death, were calculated to give the impression that modern war was no joke. That would never do. What about a crop of heroes for the next little quarrel? So out comes the *Evening News* with a daily page of Cockney stories of the war. One huge joke, from start to finish. The only wounded were those whose heads protruded above the trench through laughing so much. There may have been a bit of blood about in some parts of the battlefield, and one or two nasty accidents, but bless you, the Cockneys did not mind. They just laughed and carried on.

And that suggests an idea. Perhaps it will strike Mr. Lansbury too. Could not the new lotus-eaters of Lansbury Lidos (tarpaulin section) be supplied with a copy of the *Evening News* each evening? Before they closed their eyes in slumber they could read of the lovely times the "boys" had in France, and sigh for the next orgy of humorous slaughter. They could mitigate the rain blowing in at the sides by reading the reports of company meetings, and gathering that industry is not doing very badly after all. And possibly, they might discover a picture on the back page of Mr. Lansbury having a swing. It is a great world.

W. T. H.

READ "THE SOCIALIST"

"The Socialist," organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.), is obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office. Price 3½d. a copy, post free; or 3/6 a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

MARCH,

1930

THE PRIESTS AND POLITICS.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, and other prelates and religious leaders are making public protests about alleged religious persecution in Russia, and they ask that steps be taken involving interference in the internal affairs of Russia.

Mr. Henderson, the Foreign Secretary, in reply to questions in the House of Commons stated that "the reports of religious persecution were causing the Government grave concern."

The Executive Committee of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, in a resolution passed at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, express its "utmost horror and reprobation of the policy of persecution adopted by the Soviet Government against the Christian and other religious people of Russia, and its sacrilegious violence against all forms of religious belief." The Executive also urges upon the British Government the "imperative necessity of using to the utmost all available means of remedying this terrible situation."

How righteously indignant these people have suddenly become who were silent during the decades of Czarist persecution when the knout was freely used, Jewish pogroms were a commonplace, and "Siberia" became a byword for misery and despotism.

And the basis of their indignation is largely imaginary. The Archbishop himself, in the House of Commons on the 20th of February, stated:

"I propose to make the most exhaustive enquiries" (*Daily News*, February 21st), thereby admitting that he had so far acted on rumour.

Prebendary Gough, the head of the Christian Protest Movement, has already had to climb down when caught, and admit in the *Morning Post* for February 20th that "those who are conducting the movement are well aware that the savage orgies which were so frequent in the earlier stages of the Soviet domination do not now characterise the procedure of the persecution." But neither he nor anyone else has, so far given evidence of the earlier "savage orgies." If there were "earlier savage orgies" how is it that the righteous indignation of the priests has only now found a voice when, according to themselves, the persecution is on the wane?

Further, Arthur Ransome, in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* of February 18th, proved that Prebendary Gough's quotation from Pravda of October 25th, which he alleged was an example of the execution of "persons who openly and actively practise their religion" had been carefully doctored. The real quotation showed something else entirely—that a military monarchist organisation, composed of the remnants of bands who had distinguished themselves by especial savagery during the civil war, had formed up under the flag of a religious monastic sect, the "name-glorifiers." Gregorovitch the leader of the organisation, declared that it set itself the task of ceaseless struggle with the Soviet Government. The seat of the organisation was in the mountains, and they were buying munitions and preparing for armed revolt. The Soviet Government discovered the plot and shot the ringleaders—just as the British Government shot the ringleaders of the Sein Fein revolt in 1916, all of whom were Christians.

One may ask why the priests should suddenly become so concerned about the fate of their co-religionists in another country. The explanation is not far to seek.

Since the days of the native medicine man religion has been a prop and a handmaiden to each ruling class, and a priestly group

has evolved parallel with the evolution of Government and secured a share of the spoil from exploitation. So strong has been the position of religion that each revolution of the past has had a religious glamour cast over it and has involved modification of the creeds of defeated rulers.

So the Church that bids the sweated worker "be patient" and bear his cross in silence, cannot remain still when its position is challenged. The Church leaders imagine that the present regime in Russia threatens the existence of Religion and therefore they would be prepared to violate all the laws they bless sooner than see a diminution in their power.

COMMUNIST ROWDIES.

The *Daily Worker*, the organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain, published on January 29th, on its editorial page, an article by Mr. Harry Pollitt, under the heading "Now is the Time for Action."

Among other forms which the action is to take we get the following direct incitement to the smashing up of opponents' meetings.

Workshop meetings should be called by such workers and resolutions for the support of our Party should be carried, but the mere passing of resolutions is not enough. There should not be a Labour meeting held anywhere, but what the revolutionary workers in that district attend such meetings and fight against the speakers, whoever they are, so-called "left," "right" or centre."

They should never be allowed to address the workers. This will bring us in conflict with the authorities, but this must be done. The fight can no longer be conducted in a passive manner.

We must lead the masses in struggle against this Government and the time has arrived to use every conceivable means of political agitation. The Communist Party and its organ, the "Daily Worker," will lead the working class, fighting boldly and openly, against this Government of scoundrels and agents of capitalism.

STRATFORD**A MEETING**

will be held at

STRATFORD TOWN HALL
Sunday, March 16th

Speaker and Subject to be announced.

All Invited.
Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.
Commence 8 p.m.

ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT**IS THERE SOCIALISM IN RUSSIA?**

Stepney, E.1.

Comrade Editor,

23/1/30.

The S.P.G.B. are professed Marxian socialists, yet their attitude towards Russia refutes that. If Russia was a capitalist country, would it tolerate the Communist International (the continuing of Marx's First International), which agitates and organises workers throughout the world? Teach, too, in schools Marxian economics, and the solidarity of the workers of the world; try to stamp out illiteracy, and endeavours whenever possible to raise the standard of living for the workers. As for the inevitableness—according to economic laws of development—for Russia adopting capitalist economy, as in the French revolution, the times are different; France then, was in an environment of just developing Industrialism, Russia with its potential productiveness—in a world of highly developed capitalism—and admitted, by its aid can quickly obtain the prerequisites for Communism. It is doing so in fulfilling the five years' plan of development with resolute determination. Marx in the "Communist Manifesto" proposed certain measures to be adopted when the proletariat achieved power; Russia, when the revolution occurred, adopted those measures. Socialism is being prepared in Soviet Russia; the capitalist world is hostile to it; Socialists generally, and professed Marxian Socialists in particular should at least innovate, from capitalist hostility to Socialist help to the Workers' Republic.—Yours, etc.,

JACK MILLER.

REPLY.

Our correspondent has evidently not troubled to acquaint himself with the Socialist Party's attitude towards the Russian Bolsheviks. We state as a fact that the economic system in Russia is capitalist. Our correspondent does not attempt to give direct evidence to prove the contrary, but introduces a number of irrelevant statements to show that the other Governments are hostile to the Russian Government. Even if it were true, that hostility would not prove that there is socialism in Russia. Antagonism between Capitalist governments arising out of conflicting interests is a permanent feature of Capitalism. Has our correspondent forgotten the Great War? Or does he perhaps think that the war proved that one side or the other was Socialist?

We have never denied that the Bolsheviks would have liked to introduce Socialism if they could. What we do say is that they have not introduced Socialism and cannot do so. They are endeavouring to speed up the development of State Capitalism.

Mr. Miller asks if a Capitalist country would tolerate the Communist International "which agitates and organises the workers throughout the world." In the February SOCIALIST STANDARD we showed how the Communists "agitate and organise" the workers in this country to vote for Ramsay MacDonald. Does our correspondent think that the toleration of these activities in this country proves that we have Socialism here? Further, we flatly deny that Marx ever advocated such practices as voting for anti-Socialists as a method of attaining Socialism.

With regard to illiteracy, every Capitalist government compels the children of the workers to attend school. The difference between good intentions and the actual achievements which Russia's backward development permits, is illustrated by the figures of illiteracy. The Soviet Union Year Book shows that between 1920 and 1926 the proportion of literate people had been increased from 465 per 1,000 only to the very low figure of 567 per 1,000. (Page 474, 1929 Year Book.)

We are not aware that we have based our attitude towards Russia on what happened in France in 1789.

Our correspondent refers to measures mentioned by Marx in the Communist Manifesto. May we remind him that the detailed measures referred to were intended for the actual situation in Europe in 1847. They might be appropriate if the internal condition of Russia is similar to that of some central European states 82 years ago. Is that our correspondent's contention?

Mr. Miller says that the "Capitalist world is hostile" to Russia. In the 1929 Soviet Union Year Book (Page 43—70) are particulars of the relationship between the Russian Government and the other Capitalist Governments. The number of Commercial and other Treaties, Agreements, and Conventions with foreign governments numbered 26. The Russian Government had abroad 15 ambassadors in European capitals, 1 in America (Mexico) and 7 in Asia. Twenty countries had embassies in Moscow. Fifteen countries had consuls in Russia, and the Russian Government had consuls in 25 foreign countries. So much for "hostility."

Our correspondent would have been more accurate had he said that the Russian Government represents Capitalist interests which bring it into a greater or less degree

of conflict with some other governments. But that is true of all Capitalist states in their relationship with each other.

ED. COMM.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

A New Reader's Difficulties.

A correspondent writes telling us that he is a relatively new reader of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, but finds himself agreeing wholeheartedly with our description of the anomalies of Capitalism. He is nevertheless, he says, somewhat confused on the question of our programme of action when everybody thinks as we do and political control has been achieved.

When the machinery of government is in the hands of the Socialist Party what use is going to be made of it? In what way does the policy of Socialists differ from that of the Labour Government? What is the essential difference between Nationalisation and Municipalisation on the one hand, and Socialism on the other? Our correspondent goes on to say that he realises the "hollowness of the Labour Government's pretensions, if not their hypocrisy, together with the efforts of organised religion to keep things as they are."

CLEARING THE GROUND.

Let us, before coming to the main question, clear away one or two possible misunderstandings indicated in our questioner's last remark. It is not hypocrisy nor the activities of the Churches which are the main obstacles on the road to Socialism. Hypocrisy, the dictionary tells us, consists in "feigning to be what one is not." Now it may be said that some members and leaders in the Labour Party "feign" to be Socialists. But it must be remembered that for the most part the persons concerned do not mean or say that they want what we want, i.e., common ownership of the means of production and distribution. Generally speaking, they make it perfectly clear that when they use the word Socialism they mean something quite different, for example, Nationalisation as applied in the Post Office. It is unfortunate that they should use the word loosely and unscientifically, but that is not hypocrisy. More often than not it denotes loose thinking and muddled ideas, and the practice has grown up very largely because the Liberals and Tories have made a habit of calling the Labour Party socialist as a term of abuse.

The essence of the difference between us

and the Labour Party is that they claim Nationalisation and other schemes of reform to be means of solving the problems of poverty and unemployment, whereas we claim that common ownership—a quite different thing—and nothing but common ownership will be of use. People who vote for Labour candidates do not imagine that they are voting for common ownership, even if those candidates sometimes describe their programme as Socialism. The main obstacle to the conquest of political power for the purpose of establishing a system of society based upon common ownership of the means of production and distribution is the lack of political knowledge among the workers. The loose thinking and talking of Labour Party leaders is largely a reflection of that lack of knowledge.

As for the Church, it has to be recognised that the great majority of the electorate, including the majority of the workers, would continue to vote for Capitalism even if there were no churches. They would do so because they are satisfied with things as they are, or because their dissatisfaction is not directed against Capitalism but merely against the administration of Capitalism by a particular party or particular persons. Capitalism remains because the political machinery is in the hands of people who have no wish, and no mandate from the electors, to replace it by Socialism. Parliament, the centre of power, is controlled by Capitalist agents because the electors vote them there, either because they find Capitalism good or because they are not convinced that there is a practical alternative. Organised religion plays its part in moulding the opinions of voters, but it is a relatively small part and probably one which is decreasing in importance.

SOME TERMS EXPLAINED.

Capitalism is a system of society in which the means of producing and distributing food, clothing, and shelter, in fact all the so-called necessities and luxuries of human existence, are owned and controlled by only a part of the population. The land, the factories, the railways, steamships, aeroplanes, and so forth, are owned by a minority of people, who are correctly described as "Capitalists," i.e., persons who possess sufficient property to be able, if they so desire, to live on the income derived therefrom without the necessity of working. A minority are in this privileged position. The

great majority are not in this position but have to work for their living. They have to sell their labour-power, their mental and physical energies, to the Capitalists. Capitalism has been summed up by an anti-Socialist economist, Professor Edwin Cannon, in the following terms:—

"The majority of workers work as they are directed to work by persons and bodies of persons who employ them in order to make a profit by getting more than they pay for all expenses, and who reckon the profit as a percentage on their capital. The greater part of the property is also in the hands of such persons and institutions. ("Wealth," page 104.)

That is Capitalism, a system under which one section of the population lives by owning property, while the other section—the working class—carry on all the work of wealth production but do not own either the means of production or the products. They work for someone else and live on the wages and salaries paid to them for the sale of their labour-power. In the words of our Declaration of Principles, which our correspondent and all new readers should carefully study (see back page), Capitalist society is composed of two classes—"those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess."

Many things flow from that condition. Workers may only work how and when and where the Capitalists choose to permit them to work. When the Capitalists do not permit, unemployment is the consequence. The goods produced belong to the owners of the means of production and not to society as a whole, hence the mere existence of great quantities of useful articles, or the existence of workers able and willing to produce them, does not give a guarantee that those who need the articles shall have them. The rule of Capitalism is that goods are accessible not to those who need them but to those who can afford to pay for them. goods are produced for sale not for use, and when the Capitalist cannot sell his goods he prevents the workers from continuing to produce them by the simple process of giving his workers the "sack." Under Socialism the means of production and distribution will be owned and controlled by society as a whole and the goods produced by all the able-bodied members of society will be produced not for sale to those who can afford to pay, but directly for the use of all. The guiding principle which Socialist society will apply to production will be to organise for the manufacture of different

kinds of articles in the proportions and total quantities which society under given powers of production decides upon. Contrast that with the principle which rules under Capitalism. It was stated by Lord Cowdray in a memorandum which he drew up to show his son how to be a successful Capitalist:—

Every problem that presents itself has to be viewed and analysed from two standpoints: the first what I can make out of the enterprise; the second, what I can lose by the enterprise. (See *Daily News*, 22 February, 1930.)

WHERE DOES THE LABOUR PARTY STAND?

Socialism means a system in which articles are produced for use, not for sale. There will be no privileged class living by owning property. People will not have their "right to live" dependent upon their ability to get an employer to employ them, that is upon the employer's hopes of selling at a profit, or his willingness to spend his surplus wealth on all kinds of luxuries out of the reach of nine-tenths of the population.

But Nationalisation and Municipalisation do not involve the abolition of these features of Capitalism. The L.C.C. municipal tramways and the Government-owned Post Office are not forms of Socialism, but forms of Capitalism. Nominally "owned by the community" they are in fact owned and controlled by the Capitalist class and do not in any way alter the subject position of the working class. The services they render are not for "use" but for "sale." They are financed in just the same way as the ordinary Capitalist company. The Government receives investments of capital to finance services controlled by the Post Office, and pays interest on those investments. Similarly with the L.C.C. tramways. But even if they were not run on invested capital, and even if they were run free of charge and paid for out of rates and taxes, the position of the working class would be just what it is now. If the cost of travelling and the cost of correspondence were removed from the cost of living of the working class the result would merely be that wages—that is, the cost of keeping the workers in a fit condition to work and bring up their families—would fall correspondingly. You cannot have "Socialist" institutions inside Capitalism. Socialism is itself a system of society.

"INDIVIDUALISM" VERSUS "STATE OWNERSHIP."

The Labour Party claims to believe that "State ownership" is preferable to "Indi-

vidualism." The Socialist denies that it makes any difference to the working class, and he is not the least interested in that conflict of opinions about forms of organising Capitalist industry. We say that it makes no difference to the working class whether the railways, for example, are owned by railway shareholders, or whether the shareholders have their railway shares taken away and replaced by holdings of Government stock. That is the essence of the Labour Party's programme of Nationalisation and Municipalisation. The same privileged class are to go on drawing property incomes (that is living on wealth produced by the working class) but are to receive those incomes from the Government which becomes the employer, instead of receiving their incomes direct. The Labour Party's programme "Labour and the Nation," promises that the Labour Government will give "full publicity" to profits: the Socialist Party aims at the abolition of the whole system of profit making.

The Labour Party is now trying to make British Capitalist industry more efficient so that it can compete with foreign Capitalists. One of the ways of improving efficiency is, in the opinion of that party, to extend Nationalisation.

The Socialist Party does not want to increase the competitive power of one section of the Capitalist class against another. We are not concerned with the troubles of Capitalists in the geographical area of the United Kingdom or the Empire, but with troubles of the working class everywhere. We are aiming at dispossessing the Capitalist class and the establishment of Socialism which will necessarily be international. The method is by way of securing control of the machinery of government. We cannot get political power for the purpose of establishing Socialism until a majority are in favour of that step. The Labour Government is in office but was not elected by Socialists, and therefore has no choice but to try to administer Capitalism.

ED. COMM.

"BANK LOANS AND DEPOSITS."

MR. NICHOLLS (London, N.4).

We see no reason to believe that the late Mr. Walter Leaf meant anything but what he said. His words are quite plain—"The banks are strictly limited in their lending

operations by the amount which the depositor thinks fit to leave with them." ("Banking," p. 102.) And, "the banks can lend no more than they can borrow—in fact not nearly so much" (ibid). There is nothing in the context to indicate that he could possibly have meant anything else. You ask, "is it possible to make any normal person believe that there is a moneyed class in this country willing to remain depositors in the Big Five to the extent of upwards of £1,000 million."

If you will look up the latest balance-sheets of the "Big Five" banks you will see that their deposits total well over £1,600 million. The total of their loans and advances is only £880 million.

The relationship of gold to deposits is a quite different question. Banks pay interest on deposits not merely on the amount of gold they happen to hold. ED. COMM.

MR. F. L. RIMINGTON.

See reply to Mr. Nicholls. ED. COMM.

MR. EDWIN WRIGHT.

You based your case on a statement ("every bank loan creates a deposit") which you attributed to Mr. McKenna. We did not attempt to meet the point merely by quoting a different opinion expressed by the late Mr. Walter Leaf, but gave as well the evidence on which he based his opinion. We notice that you ignore this evidence.

Mr. McKenna's present views and the practice of the bank of which he is Chairman, certainly do not correspond with the theories which you say were held by him. At the Midland Bank annual meeting (22nd January) Mr. McKenna made the following statements in his address (See *Times*, 23rd January):—

It is a common notion to judge from speeches and letters in the Press, that the banks have an inexhaustible power of lending money to industrial enterprises, and that any industry suffering from general depression could be restored to prosperity if only what is termed a more generous policy were adopted by the banks. (Laughter!) A moment's reflection, however, will show that the banks have no inexhaustible fund to draw upon. The sums they lend are balanced by amounts due to depositors, who would certainly not rest content unless confident that their money was being wisely used and could be repaid to them at any time.

According to the theory which you say Mr. McKenna held, the banks ought to be able to create deposits at will and thus draw upon "an inexhaustible fund." It is evi-

dent that Mr. McKenna, like the late Mr. Walter Leaf, does not share your view.

ED. COMM.

DO YOU KNOW?

That an Examiner in the Bankruptcy Department of the Civil Service, who was fired on the 18th February for accepting a bribe, was paid the munificent rate of £4 5s. 0d. per week? And yet you are urged to support Government ownership!

* * *

That according to Fenner Brockway, London M.P., and member of the National Council of the I.L.P., "The present tendency is that, despite a Labour Government, Capitalism is being strengthened." And yet the I.L.P. urge you to support the Labour Government!

* * *

That Baron Rothschild and his friends, "in a six weeks' trip . . . bagged five lions, five buffaloes, two rhinoceros, and five antelopes." They did it from an aeroplane because it was safer! And yet one and a half millions of workers cannot find a job, and the rest are urged to accept reductions because industry "cannot afford to pay" a decent wage to all!

* * *

That British motor-car producers (in the interests of free competition!) threaten to "force British agents to sell only British cars. . . . It is the intention in future contracts, it is understood, to change the wording to enable the supply of cars by any British maker to an offending agent to be stopped at once. All producing firms in the British motor industry have agreed to this." And yet the hypocrites who rule us complain and threaten war when the Chinaman or the Hindu suggests "supporting their home industries"!

* * *

That the Labour Party are only administering Capitalism, like the previous Governments, and therefore cannot make any appreciable difference in the number of unemployed, because they cannot force the self-acting doors on the tube railways to bring back the discharged porters, the automatic machines to bring back the booking clerks that are superfluous or all the other improvements in machines and organisation—in Government departments as well as outside—that "save labour" to suddenly

bring back the workers that have been rendered superfluous. All sections of the International Capitalist class are engaged in a mad rush to obtain markets by cheapening production, i.e., by reducing the number of workers employed to produce given quantities of goods.

That Ramsay MacDonald has found from his practical experience of "Government" that his earlier ideas were too "advanced"? That's what comes of wearing a top-hat and going to dinner with "the people that prey."

That "the Angel of Mons were motion pictures thrown upon 'screens' of foggy white cloudbanks in Flanders by cinematograph projecting machines mounted on German aeroplanes which hovered above the British lines," that the British Command was aware of the trick and turned the vision to their own benefit? No means are too despicable for employment in modern wars, because the latter are the product of one of the most despicable instincts—profit-seeking.

That Lord Beaverbrook's new party is only the latest stunt to keep the worker's mind off the real cause of his troubles—the private ownership of the means of production. One can prophecy with a fair amount of confidence the line the next General Election will take: On the one side, Conservatives, and on the other Liberals and Labourites arguing about the incidence of this or that item of taxation, and the worker's slave position will be obscured by the smoke screen of useless argument. Whether there are high taxes, low taxes or no taxes, the worker remains a slave to the owners of the means of production, who, at the same time, are the rulers of society today. And until the worker turns a deaf ear to all kinds of stunts he will remain a slave.

GILMAC.

NOTICE TO READERS.

Readers are invited to send in their suggestions as to features which they would like to see in the *Socialist Standard*, and their questions to be answered. While we cannot undertake to adopt all suggestions, we shall welcome readers' proposals for increasing the effectiveness of our paper as a means of carrying on Socialist Propaganda.

SOCIALISM IN SHEFFIELD. THE RECENT BY-ELECTION.

The recent by-election in Sheffield would have appeared tragic had it not been so amusing. After a knock-out contest lasting several rounds the Labour nominee emerged into full public view in the form of a local Trade Unionist.

The Communist candidate, J. T. Murphy, also made the most of his local connections and his activities in the shop-stewards' movement during the war. His supporters, however, do not appear to have learned the lesson of the collapse of that movement, but still cling to the "industrialist" illusions associated therewith. In the face of experience of the power of the employers on the economic field (as exemplified in rationalisation, etc.), they still swallow the yarn that it is possible to develop a movement which will "take and hold" at the point of production and successfully challenge the armed forces of the nation. Murphy took his stand on the Communist Party's programme of reforms (comically labelled "class against class") and left the basis of Capitalism untouched. He had the easy job of pillorying the failure of the Labour Government to solve the problems afflicting the workers; but in general his remedy was the delightfully vague one of "raising the workers' standard of living." Challenged to explain why the Communist Party had supported the Labour Party at elections over a period of six or seven years he took refuge in the feeble plea that the Labour leaders had been "obliged by circumstances to appear on the side of the workers." From which we reach the conclusion that the Communist Party backed them in 1923 and 1924 because the said leaders "led" the strike of 1926!

This champion of a "disciplined revolutionary international," however, was candid enough to admit that the Communists had maintained their support of the Labour Party "too long." They should, he said, have abandoned that policy immediately after the strike fiasco and not have waited till 1929. He was thereupon challenged to debate with a representative of the S.P.G.B., and this he accepted with the assurance that "he would debate with the devil himself." We cannot promise the workers of Sheffield any display of Mephistophelian fireworks, but the debate may provide them with food for thought.

The Labour nominee's case was so feeble that he dropped seven or eight thousand votes. Tory criticism was directed towards showing that "Socialism" had failed to do anything but add to the numbers of the unemployed, and relatively speaking he got away with the story very well. Possibly on some future occasion the local branch may invite him to explain why two million unemployed exist in Germany, and from three million upwards in the U.S.A., countries which have enjoyed the benefits of "safeguarding" for generations.

The Liberals' case was that the Labour Government needed gingering up, but probably could, with paternal supervision, be relied upon to do the right thing. "After all," argued their street corner orators, "it was the Liberals who had made it possible for the Labour Party to experiment in social reform."

The election proved once more the vast amount of propagandist spade-work needed in this reputed "hot-bed of Socialism." We are not greedy! Socialists in Sheffield are invited, nay urged, to come and give a hand in this work.

E. B.

TOTTENHAM A MEETING

will be held at

TRADES HALL, TOTTENHAM

SUNDAY, MARCH 23rd.

Speaker:— E. LAKE.

Subject—

"The Outcome of the Class Struggle."

All Invited.

Admission Free.

Questions and Discussion.

Commence 7.30 p.m.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153½, Blackfrairs Road, S.E.

KARL MARX ON THE SUFFRAGE.

(Reprinted from "Labour Monthly," Dec., 1929.)

"We now come to the Chartists, the politically active portion of the British working class. The six points of the Charter which they contend for, contain nothing but the demand of universal suffrage, and of the conditions without which universal suffrage would be illusory for the working class: such as the ballot, payment of members, annual general elections. But universal suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class of England, where the proletariat form the large majority of the population, where, in a long, though underground, civil war, it has gained a clear consciousness of its position as a class, and where even the rural districts know no longer any peasants, but landlords, industrial Capitalists (farmers) and hired labourers. The carrying of universal suffrage in England would, therefore, be a far more Socialistic measure than anything which has been honoured with that name on the Continent.

"Its inevitable result here, is the political supremacy of the working class."

—("N.Y. Tribune," Aug. 25th, 1852.)

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE CITY.

Mr. Snowden and Mr. MacDonald have recently received the Freedom of the City of London. Addressing the bankers, stock-brokers and city business men gathered at the Guildhall on the occasion, Mr. Snowden said:—

The Prime Minister and he perhaps held different views from those who had been given the honour before. "That illustrates," said Mr. Snowden, "one of the finest traits of British life—a toleration of opinions with which we differ—and it shows still more that the political controversies which divide us are petty and trivial compared with the vital things which unite us."

—("Edinburgh Evening News," 19th Dec.)

Yet there are people who describe the Labour Party as a class party—a Working Class Party.

C.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sunday ... Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E. 1
8 p.m.
Clapham Common, 11 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Wednesdays ... Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
HANLEY BRANCH.
Sundays ... Hanley Market Square, 7 p.m.
Burslem, St. John Square, 7 p.m.
GLASGOW BRANCH.
Sundays ... West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA**.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE**.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM**.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CENTRAL**.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- EAST LONDON**.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW**.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 99, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.
- HACKNEY**.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. as above.
- HANLEY**.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.
- ISLINGTON**.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.
- LEYTON**.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER**.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON**.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).
- SHEFFIELD**.—Branch meets Thursdays 8 p.m. at 44, Edgedale Road. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA**.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- SOUTHWARK**.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- TOOTING**.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM**.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW**.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD**.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.
- WEST HAM**.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 308. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHAT PRICE NATIONALISATION? THE "PAMPERED" CIVIL SERVICE.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain has always opposed Nationalisation or State capitalism. The Labour Party, the I.L.P., and the Communists are at one in supporting it. The following facts and figures will show what Nationalisation means in practice, and show how little difference there is from the workers' point of view between State capitalism and private capitalism, whether under a Conservative or a Labour Government.

LOW PAY AND NO PENSION.

The figures given below relating to pay and pensions are taken from leaflets issued by the Staff Side of the Civil Service National Whitley Council. They are all based directly upon information given in the House of Commons by Ministers of the Crown. 150,000 Civil Servants, representing 50 per cent. of the non-industrial staff, receive less than £3 a week inclusive of cost of living bonus.

225,000 (75 per cent.) receive less than £4.

Only 8 per cent. receive £7 a week or more.

Only half of the Civil Servants are pensionable. Out of 300,000 "non-industrial" Civil Servants 110,000 are not eligible for pension. Out of 120,000 "industrial" civil servants (Post Office engineers, dockyard workers, etc.) only 30,000 are pensionable.

Mr. Lees-Smith, Postmaster-General, stated in the House of Commons on July 22nd, 1929, that out of 180,000 full-time Post Office employees, only 60,000 receive more than 70s.; 81,000 receive between 50s. and 70s.; and 21,000 receive between 40s. and 50s. The remainder receive less than 40s. A basis for comparison with the pay in a non-State concern is afforded by the Under-

ground Electric Railway Company. At the 1929 Annual General Meeting, the Chairman, Lord Ashfield, stated that out of a total staff of 43,500, only 1,400 adults (about 3 per cent.) received less than £3 a week. (*Economist*, March 9th, 1929; and *State Service*, March, 1929.)

Even after allowing for the fact that the Post Office figures include a proportion of juveniles in the group below 40s. a week, and allowing for certain other factors which have to be taken into account, it is evident that Post Office pay is certainly not higher than that of the Underground Railway staffs, and is in all probability appreciably lower.

TEMPORARY AND PART-TIME WORKERS.

The Post Office employs over 3,000 temporary full-time employees as telegraphists, counter-clerks, telephonists, etc. None of these employees are paid more than 57s. a week. A temporary postman's rate in London is 49s. or 51s.; porters get 49s.; and telephonists (women) from 39s. 6d. to 43s. 6d.

In the Provinces men sorting clerks and telegraphists are paid at rates varying from 46s. to 57s., and postmen from 44s. to 49s.; women sorting clerks and telegraphists are paid from 37s. 6d. to 47s. 6d. (See Year Book of the Union of Post Office Workers, pages 390-393.)

The Post Office employs about 13,000 auxiliary postmen for a varying number of hours not exceeding 36 per week. Before the war it used to be said in defence of the low pay of these men that they were expected to have other employment. Now this pretence has been dropped, and it is admitted officially that many of them are

known to be fully dependent on their Post Office pay owing to their inability to obtain other work. Even if unemployment were not as widespread as it is, men bound down to Post Office hours of attendance would find it difficult to fit in other employment.

For a 36-hour week an auxiliary postman receives from 43s. 5d. to 47s. 8d. in London, and from 35s. 9d. to 40s. 10d. in the Provinces. Those who are not given the full 36 hours' work, receive correspondingly less. The majority work between 18 and 30 hours. (See pages 144-151. Award 1325, of the Industrial Court, July, 1927.)

"SKILLED" WORK AT LABOURER'S PAY.

The Journal of the Post Office Engineering Union (February 21st, 1930), in an editorial, states that Post Office engineering labourers are employed on skilled and semi-skilled work, without being correspondingly paid:—

Post Office engineering labourers do work which, in outside trades, would be allotted to mates and paid for at something between the skilled and unskilled rates. . . . A great many labourers are employed on skilled duties for long periods; . . . the labourer's staff was, in fact, a staff trained by the Post Office to get skilled and semi-skilled work done at a price below a fair rate for such work.

The labourers are not pensioned or permanent, and have just been refused an increase in pay.

PROFIT THE ONLY CONSIDERATION.

The Labour Postmaster-General, Mr. Lees-Smith, M.P., in a letter to the P.O. Engineering Union (see P.O.E.U. Journal, February 7th, 1930), defends the dismissals of engineering staff in the following terms:

The need for a reduction of costs is, however, paramount; and so long as this can be effected by reorganisation and the introduction of improved methods of working, the Postmaster-General feels compelled to pursue the policy which has been initiated. . . . As there would be no justification for retaining men for whom no work is available, reductions in staff have been inevitable.

The Union's only suggested remedy was that the Post Office should do certain work itself which is now put out to contractors. In other words, it proposed to solve the problem of unemployed Post Office engineers by increasing the unemployment among engineers employed by the private companies!

NO POLITICS.

Finally, it is interesting to notice that the Labour Government does not intend to

abolish the restrictions which have been imposed by earlier governments on the political activities of civil servants. The following question and answer are taken from *Hansard* of January 27th, 1930 (Column 644).

Mr. FREEMAN asked the Prime Minister whether he will consider the desirability of introducing legislation removing the present disabilities of free speech and action on political matters at present imposed on civil servants?

Mr. P. SNOWDEN: His Majesty's Government endorse the well-established rule of the Civil Service that civil servants should take no overt part in public political affairs, and I am not prepared to introduce legislation which would be inconsistent with the maintenance of this general principle of conduct.

Presumably if the Labour Party had their way, and introduced State capitalism throughout the chief manufacturing and transport industries, we should all be civil servants and all debarred from active political work. H.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.

Will members and sympathisers living in the neighbourhood of Newcastle-on-Tyne communicate with Edmund Howarth, 14, Dryden Road, Low Fell, Gateshead, with a view to forming a branch.

THE 26th ANNUAL PARTY CONFERENCE

WILL BE HELD ON

Friday and Saturday, April 18th and 19th,

FAIRFAX HALL,

STANHOPE GARDENS, HARRINGAY, N.

Commence at 10 a.m. Open to All.

THE ANNUAL PARTY RE-UNION

will take place in the above Hall on

GOOD FRIDAY, APRIL 18th at 7.30 p.m.

DOORS OPEN 7 p.m.

Tickets from any Branch Secretary, or Head Office

You should read . . .

'THE SOCIALIST'

Organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.)

Obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office.

Price 3½d. per copy, post free; or 3/6 a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

BROTHERLY LOVE IN THE U.S.A.

Mr. Sinclair Lewis, the author of "Babbitt," "Main Street," and other widely read novels, dealing with life in the U.S.A., was on the spot during the recent embittered struggle between mill-owners and cotton workers at Marion, North Carolina, one of the new industrial areas in the Southern States. He was inspired to write a pamphlet, "Cheap and Contented Labor," in which he tells of some of the incidents of industrial conflict as it is waged in America. It is written in simple, direct language, and is a powerful indictment of the unrestrained brutality of the employing class when they believe their interests to be endangered.

The operatives were on strike for an increase in their wages of 13 dollars a week—a starvation wage at American prices.

No sooner had the workers struck than all the forces of capitalist suppression were turned against them. Armed militia fired upon them on the least provocation. Hospitals refused to tend their sick and wounded. The law courts discounted their evidence, and charges were fabricated in the favour of the employers. Parsons ranted and demanded public whipping posts as a punishment for the "agitators."

General housing and social conditions in Marion are appalling, and call to mind the conditions of the mining and cotton districts of England in the early days of English factory development. Mr. Lewis, who has visited the Lancashire cotton districts, says that the condition of the workers there "is the abomination of desolation," but, he adds, these are "some three or four hundred per cent. superior to those of the workers in Marion." To any who are acquainted with the cotton districts of England such a comparison is enough.

We are also told that the conditions of the mill-workers of Marion are representative of scores of mill towns in America.

However, America still is a land of "prosperity and golden opportunities"—for the Capitalist. For the workers—slavery.

Mr. Lewis wants to abolish this slavery, although in this pamphlet he does not tell us what are his own views on the method of doing it.

H. W.

SOCIALISM AND VIOLENCE.

An interesting question has been put to us by a reader; a question we have dealt with repeatedly during the past 25 years. He says, quite correctly, that we "advocate getting to power by means of the vote, and condemn the use of physical force." He asks what are our grounds for condemning the use of force: "Is it because you believe it to be morally wrong, or do you condemn it because you realise it to be futile?"

Let us first deal with the question of morals. Any reader of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, who stops to compare our articles with those in the propaganda papers of other organisations must have been struck by the complete absence of arguments based upon the accepted moral principles of present, capitalist, society. That absence is not accidental, but deliberate, and follows naturally from our Socialist view of economics and politics. Our approach to the problems of life is a scientific one, based so far as is possible, upon observed facts and verifiable general statements. We know what we want; we want something which is practicable and possible; and our methods are determined by the aim we have in view and the material which is available for getting there. We have no need ourselves to gloss over our aims and actions with a "moral" justification based upon our opponent's beliefs and prejudices. We are satisfied that nothing is to be gained in the long run by trying to get support for Socialism by appealing to the moral sentiments of people who do not understand and accept Socialism.

To get Socialism the working class must gain power, that is the control of the machinery of government. Our correspondent will perhaps be surprised to learn that we do not condemn the use of force. On the contrary we seek control of the machinery of government which (in the words of our Declaration of Principles) includes "the armed forces of the nation." It is because the control of the armed forces of the nation is so important that we wish to control them. The vote is the method of attaining control of the machinery of government in the developed capitalist countries. The policy of bringing the unarmed workers out on to the streets against the armed forces controlled by the capitalist state, is not condemned by us as a less effective method of gaining political control; we condemn it because it is not a method of gain-

ing political control at all. It is just dangerous silliness (except when it is deliberately engineered by the ruling powers themselves).

SUPPOSE THE CAPITALISTS ABOLISHED THE VOTE.

Then our correspondent puts a further question. He asks if it has never occurred to us that the capitalists might one day abolish the vote.

In reply we must point out that the possibility of such action is a further reason for following the policy laid down by the Socialist Party. When the Socialists have shown, by means of the vote, that they are within short reach of becoming the majority, the abolition of the vote by the capitalists would do infinite harm, not to us, but to them.

For the "Constitutionalists" and "Democrats," as the capitalist parties always boast of being, to destroy those two strong planks in their propaganda platform, would enormously weaken their hold on the allegiance of those workers still not convinced of the soundness of the Socialist case. A party which abandoned the claim to represent the majority would be committing political suicide. The capitalists (including the self-styled dictators, Mussolini and the rest) tenaciously cling to the forms of democracy and constitutionalism because (apart from other reasons) they realise their propaganda value, even if our correspondent does not. It would be absurd for the working class to weaken their own position by adopting unconstitutional methods when those methods brought no gain whatever.

But the more important point has been missed by our correspondent. He has not asked himself what would happen next after the abolition of the vote. He has not realised that the capitalist class have to do something else besides govern the working class—they have to administer the capitalist system. The workings of capitalist trade and finance, the production and distribution of wealth, the elaborate machinery for educating the workers and for adjusting the thousand and one social-frictions incidental to capitalism, all of this complex, enormous, and growing machinery, has necessitated the system of representative government. No other means has yet been devised which will give the stability which is indispensable to the smooth running of capitalism. Our correspondent writes of "dictatorship"

replacing the vote, as if it were a simple operation bringing no consequences of importance. So far is this from being true that none of the "dictators" in various European countries have been able to do any such thing. Rather they have extended the number of voters.

It has also to be remembered that capitalists are human beings, most of them more interested in living than in dying heroically for the sake of a theory. A few of the hotheads may prefer to wreck society, including themselves, rather than give way to the Socialist majority; but will their own capitalist friends back them up? Most capitalists will prefer to accept Socialism rather than stand by a minority who might wish to attempt the task of running capitalism without representative machinery, and against the organised majority. They might think it fine to fight (and starve) in the last ditch in defence of capitalism, but more pleasant, if less heroic, to go on living.

Further, our correspondent must have overlooked the fact that by that time the armed forces—drawn from working class homes—would be mainly sympathetic to the Socialist viewpoint. Given the abandonment of democratic methods by the Government of the day after the Socialist Party had at an election received a majority of the votes, the armed forces would no longer be a dependable instrument for the capitalist minority, and would, in fact, help, not hinder, the majority in their endeavours to secure control of the machinery of Government. But that eventuality—the armed forces helping the Socialist working class to gain control—is quite different from the Communist Party policy of a minority fighting the armed forces.

The situation under those hypothetical conditions is widely different from the situation now. Socialists are now in a small minority; the ruling class is backed by the majority, including the majority of the workers; the capitalist state is in full control of disciplined armed forces, and the members of these forces are not yet affected by Socialist ideas.

Physical force against the armed forces is lunacy. Those who advocate it never tell us how they propose to get arms and equipment, tanks, battleplanes, cruisers, poison gas plant, etc., and how they are going to train their forces to use such things. They do not tell us because, when

faced with those questions, they know that there is no answer.

In conclusion, let us put the whole matter in proper perspective by pointing out that the really important and difficult problem is not the problem of action after the working class have been won over to Socialism, but the present problem of winning them over. Even if there were an alternative method of gaining control of the political machinery, it would be useless for the purpose of running society on a Socialist basis if the working class did not understand and want Socialism.

ED. COMM.

SOCIALISM AND PSYCHOLOGY.

An Open Letter to a Critic.

Dear X,

You ask me what I am doing for the community, and whether I have not underestimated the important differences of type or character in human beings which you consider such a formidable obstacle to the establishment of Socialism. I will try and answer your questions.

In the first place, let me direct your attention to the fact that the "community," for which you expect me to do something, is sharply divided into two distinct classes, one of which owns the means of living of the other. Do not take my word for this! Professor Clay (I know you are impressed by Professors), a most respectable person, told us, on February 19th, 1925, in the sober columns of the *Manchester Guardian*, that less than 6 per cent. of the population held four-fifths of the national capital and received nearly half the national income. Just think that over carefully and you will cease to wonder that the majority of people are poor, no matter how hard they toil.

No psychologist has ever yet discovered how to live upon fresh air! He or she always wants food in his or her tummy, clothes to prevent arrest, if nothing else, and a "home"! And to-day, the means whereby food, clothing and shelter are produced are owned in the main by considerably less than a tenth of the population.

The vast mass of the community feed and breed only by permission of the tiny section which owns the resources (land, factories, machinery, etc.), without which feeding and breeding are impossible to-day; and the conditions upon which this permission is granted are that the property-

less ones shall toil for the profit of those who own and control the means of existence.

The members of the class to which you and I belong surrender the product of their toil to their kind employers, who graciously return to them a sum of money capable of buying back goods to the value of only a fraction of their product. The master-class (mostly composed of inactive shareholders) are enabled to live in luxury and also amass fresh capital to make still more profit.

This has not always been so. In the Middle Ages the class which attempted to live by trade and money-lending was despised and persecuted by the feudal lords and their vassal land-holders, and condemned by the Church. One day, when you have nothing better to do, you might ask your psychological tutor to explain the curious volte-face on the part of the reformed Church towards the taking of interest. As he believes that the human mind is an independent entity, which develops regardless of material conditions and social environment, I can readily imagine some entertaining mental contortions on his part. To maintain any degree of consistency he will have to maintain that the Church received a sudden revelation from those "forces" which are hidden so mysteriously somewhere "behind the universe"! But the above is only one of the many changes in social life and in men's corresponding ideas and customs.

Go far back in history and you will come to a time when neither money nor territory nor chattels but kinship formed the root condition of social organisation, and it is from this misty past that the creatures of religious fancy take their rise.

In those days a few crude tools and weapons were men's only equipment against nature (animal, vegetable and mineral), yet even these represented ages of experiment. Ideas of practical utility were hard to come by and slow in growth, and so, men's wishes outstripped their acts and built up an imaginary world transcending ordinary human limitations wherein men's shades became transfigured into gods. It is from this primitive ignorance of men that the concept of a "soul" (or psyche) was derived. The individual was credited with possessing an immortal shadow or second self, which controlled his body as a man operates any other inert object.

"Mind" was held to dominate "matter," and the "modern" psychologist, who clings tenaciously to this superstition does but proclaim how little, in this respect, he has progressed beyond the savage.

The materialistic Socialist, however, reviewing human history perceives how overwhelming has been the effect of economic development upon the habits of mankind and how, in practice, Christians and other metaphysicians have flown in the face of their avowed doctrines in the pursuit of their material interests.

The ruling classes throughout history have imposed systems of discipline and so-called education upon their subjects which would be meaningless if man's "soul" controlled man's behaviour. Is the "immortal" susceptible to training and the environment of the school? But let us return to our boiled beef and carrots!

The class to which you and I belong consists of individuals whose characters are as varied as their physical make-ups. In this respect it does not differ from the master-class nor, indeed, from any class that has ever existed. From this fact it is clear that social position does not rest upon individual character. A man is either a worker or a capitalist, not because he has a peculiar temperament or disposition, but because his environment and history have so determined. To explain the difference between him and others we can only refer to this same environmental history. Try how we will we cannot discover any mysterious entity which decides that certain individuals shall dig coal for a living while others clip coupons. In short, the illusion that "character is destiny" sums up the stupid conceit of the master-class, who childishly fancy that "God" or "Fate" has blessed them with "superior natures." They mistake the effect for the cause, and imagine that their privileged position is due to their "culture," instead of realising that their "culture" is the fruit of their privileged position in society.

Socialists aim at the foundation of a system based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means of living. In such a society individuals will continue to vary, but it is in the common necessities of all that social life is rooted. Capitalist society has long since ceased to be consistent with the satisfactory distribution of these necessities. Hence the turmoil of modern social life. The

"superior persons" of the master-class will, no doubt, resist the change as long as possible; but every ruling class in history has bitten the dust in due course when economic development has dug its grave. Psychological trickery may delay, it cannot prevent, the slow but sure awakening of the working-class, the class whose mission is to give to capitalism a conclusive exit to the land of shades. E. B.

THE DECAY OF RELIGION.

With institutions there are degrees, even of deadness. Religion, for instance, may be deader than we think. The following extract from the religious notes in the *Daily News* of March 5th is quite illuminating:—

"UNHOLY SCRAMBLE."

An Anglican clergyman has described to me what he alleges to be the "unholy scramble" that goes on behind the scenes for clerical appointments in the patronage of the Crown. He states that every possible string is pulled, not of course by the clergyman himself, but by his friends (with his knowledge). No avenue of approach is refused and a political caucus could not behave with greater skill and discrimination. While the friends of one man are at work he knows full well that several other clergymen are being pushed forward in a similar manner. Everyone concerned hates the system. But, as my informant says: "What can be done to improve it and place such patronage upon a more dignified basis?"

This we might usefully follow with the following extract from Robert Graves' "Good-bye to All That."

It was said that not one soldier in a hundred was inspired by religious feeling of even the crudest kind.

For the regimental chaplains as a body we had no respect. If the regimental chaplains had shown one-tenth the courage, endurance and other human qualities that the regimental doctors showed, we agreed the B.E.F. might well have started a religious revival. But they had not. The fact is that they were under orders not to get mixed up with the fighting, to stay behind with the transport, and not to risk their lives. No soldier could have any respect for a chaplain who obeyed these orders, and yet there was not in our experience, one chaplain in fifty who was not glad to obey them. Occasionally on a quiet day, in a quiet section, the chaplain would make a daring afternoon visit to the support line, and distribute a few cigarettes, and that was all. But he was always in evidence back in rest-billets. Sometimes the colonel would summon him to come up with the rations and bury the day's dead, and he would arrive, speak his lines and hastily retire.

There you have two pictures of the value of superstition as a guide to living. There is a "holy scramble" for jobs in the world of witch-doctors when what is called

peace is the order of things. When war presents the opportunity of a quick acquaintance with the joys of heaven, the self-appointed guides show a strange reluctance to leave the solid earth. Whether Robert Graves knew Prof. J. B. S. Haldane or not is not known to the writer, but it is remarkable how similar are their observations.

In an essay called "Mercy" in his "Possible Worlds," Prof. Haldane says:

I should be the last to suggest that the late war was a good thing, but there is no doubt it furnished a rough test of character. It will therefore be interesting to analyse the conduct of ministers of religion during its course.

He proceeds, in the course of the essay, to do so. The following are fair extracts:

A large number of the younger clergy became army chaplains. In this way they at once obtained the very satisfactory status of commissioned officers. With other officers that status was on the whole a fair return for the very grave dangers which they ran. The army chaplains generally ran the irreducible minimum of risk. Most of them kept well behind the line. In my war experience I never saw a chaplain display courage.

Another extract.

It may be contended that I was unfortunate in my acquaintance among army chaplains, and biased in my interpretation of their conduct. It is therefore important to examine the behaviour of the clergy as a body. When conscription was introduced in Britain the clergy of all denominations showed a unanimity without parallel since the Reformation. Conscription was not for them, and so great was clerical influence among the governing classes that their exemption was taken as a matter of course. Now from a Christian point of view, it is perhaps arguable that ministers of religion should not fight. But there is absolutely no reason why the self-styled disciples of Jesus should not, as privates of the R.A.M.C., have tended the sick and wounded under conditions of moderate discomfort if relatively little danger.

The final extract.

Priests have always used their power to evade the moral obligations of the ordinary man; and threatened him with fire here or hereafter, or with social or economic penalties if he referred to the fact. What is new in the situation is that the public is beginning to recognise the moral and intellectual inferiority of the clergy. Their income is diminishing, and it is not likely to increase. For whereas the clergy of sixty years and over are on the whole men of fair intelligence, those of to-day are being recruited from the dregs of the universities, whilst many have no higher education at all. Under these circumstances they are hardly likely to tap fresh sources of revenue.

So there you are. Knowledge and correct action will kill capitalism; religion will flicker out. W. T. H.

OUR CIRCULATION.

HOW YOU CAN HELP TO ENLARGE IT.

We want to get new readers and we know that we can look to our regular subscribers to do all they can to help. There must be many thousands of workers, who, if they were introduced to THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, would be as pleased to read it as we would be pleased to add them to our list of subscribers. It is all a question of bringing our paper and our party to the notice of men and women who will be interested, and that is above all a matter for the present readers. Is there not at least one man or woman among your circle of friends and acquaintances who might be glad to read what the Socialist Party has to say about current events and Socialist principles? Why not send us the name and address and 6d. in stamps for a copy to be forwarded for three months? Why not pass on your own copy when you have read it? or, better still, place an order for two copies, and use the additional one for the purpose of gaining a new regular reader?

If you have opportunities for discussing Socialism at your Trade Union Branch meeting, or if you attend the meetings of other Parties, write to this office and ask for some specimen copies of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for free distribution.

If you happen to live where there is no branch of the S.P.G.B., you can, as other isolated sympathisers have done in the past, make THE SOCIALIST STANDARD the means of slowly but steadily bringing in new readers, who will in time become members and help you to form that branch which you want to see established.

Let us have the name and address of the secretary of any local trade union or political party branch to which you think it might be worth while for us to send specimens of our literature.

Do all of these things, and if you have further ideas on developing our circulation, write and tell us about them.

DEATH OF A COMRADE.

We regret to have to announce the death on March 10th, of W. Steele, for 19 years a member of Tottenham Branch.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ..	2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free ..	1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

APRIL,



1930

THE USELESSNESS OF REFORMS.**AN IMPORTANT ADMISSION.**

Those who oppose Socialism and urge a policy of getting "something now" in the shape of social reforms habitually ignore the strength of the pressure which the employing class are able to bring to bear to force down wages towards the minimum consistent with efficiency.

What is the value to the workers of giving them unemployment pay if the "gift" is accompanied by a reduction in wages? The existence of a large and increasing army of unemployed puts the employers always in the position of being able to secure such readjustments.

In a report on wages in the wool textile industry, Lord MacMillan, appointed by the Labour Government to preside over a court of inquiry, recommends a wage reduction. He uses as one of his justifications for reducing pay the fact that social services have lessened the demands on the workers' wages. In effect the "gains" secured by the vast efforts of the Labour Party and its supporters over many years are being nullified by reductions in wages. The reforms reduce the workers' cost of living, but the employers it is who reap the benefit.

Lord MacMillan's actual words are as follows (quoted in *The Times*, March 7th):—

(In former times the prudent workman had to

make provision out of his wages for various eventualities, the risk of which is now covered by one or other of what are known as the "social services". . . . Thus the workman is now insured against ill-health, unemployment, accident, old age, and blindness, and provision is also made for his widows and orphans. In addition money from public sources is provided in connection with the health of mothers and children and the prevention and treatment of disease, as well as for the relief of the destitute and the care of the physically or mentally infirm. . . . I think it relevant to point out that they play a substantial part in improving the standard of life of the workman and lightening the burden on his wages.

ANOTHER HALF-BRICK.

The "step-at-a-time" politicians of the I.L.P. and the Labour Party are for ever defending themselves on the plea that "half-a-loaf is better than no bread." The first half-brick which the Labour Government delivered was a 6½ per cent. reduction in pay for the cotton workers. Now comes a recommendation for a reduction for wool workers, ranging from 3s. to 5s. a week. (*Daily Herald*, March 8th.) The *Herald* in an editorial describes this as "a victory from the employer's point of view."

We would like to ask in what way "a victory from the employer's point of view," ushered in by MacDonald and his party, differs from a similar victory engineered by Baldwin.

And in view of the fact that a majority of the Labour M.P.s are members of the I.L.P. will Mr. Maxton tell us how many half-bricks make one "Socialism in our Time"?

CLASSES, BUT NO CLASS ANTAGONISM

The "Manchester Guardian" (January 11th) has a delightfully phrased hope about class relationships. The *Socialist* points out that under Capitalism there is an owning class which lives by owning, and a non-owning class which has to work for the owners. The remedy for the resulting class conflict is to abolish private ownership and the class division. The "Manchester Guardian" has a brighter idea:—

We have got to eliminate from the industrial state that rancour between the privileged and the disinherited, of which the heated controversies about the "dole" are the latest form.

A really choice piece of Liberal impudence. Let us keep the privileged and the disinherited, but let us find out how to induce the latter not to harbour hard thoughts about the former!

S.

MARX AMONG THE CLASSICS.**AN "EXPERT" WRITES AN INTRODUCTION.**

At last the first volume of Marx's great work on Capitalist Production has been brought within easy reach of the workers' pockets.

Forty-three years ago the first English translation appeared in two volumes, but the price put it beyond the average worker's means.

Few workers, unfortunately, were interested in studying Marx in those days, and when later on the publishers, Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., became a limited company they sold the copyright of Marx's "Capital" to a firm who issued it as a publishers remainder. The same type was continually used to print from until it became impossible to print again, unless the work was reset in new type.

The translation, however, was a good one. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling had performed a creditable task, and Frederick Engels, the co-worker of Marx, revised the work on completion.

When the sheets printed from the old type had been used up, the copyright holders would not go to the expense of setting up the book again, and so "Capital" was no longer published in this country.

Last year, Swan Sonnenschein's successors, Allen and Unwin, Ltd., went to the expense of having "Capital" translated afresh, and published in a well-printed volume at 12s. 6d. Eden and Cedar Paul made a very readable translation, and a copy was sent by the translators to our late comrade, J. Fitzgerald, for review. This appeared in *THE SOCIALIST STANDARD* last year. The price, however, was still too high for the worker.

This, we are pleased to say, has now been remedied. "Capital" has been included in the *Everyman Library* (translated by E. and C. Paul), among the great classics of literature, science, philosophy. The great volume on Capitalist Production is now to be had in two volumes at 2s. each. The size is a handy one, and will easily fit into the pocket. The print is good, and the general get-up makes it a credit to those responsible.

For years Marx's work was treated with a "conspiracy of silence." Economic development, with its effects on the workers, was, however, on Marx's side, and so more and more workers became interested in

reading and studying "Capital," in order to understand the inner workings of the system and the nature of its Economics. The "conspiracy of silence" has gone to a large extent, and now practically every bookstall and bookshop will have "Marx" on sale.

THE "EXPERT" INTRODUCES MARX.

The reader of this new edition will be astounded to find that it contains an introduction by G. D. H. Cole, which is not an introduction to Marx's work at all.

Mr. Cole, who was a Fabian, Guild Socialist, and Labour Party propagandist, is now a member of the Government's Economic Advisory Council. He has never been a supporter of Marx's economic ideas, and his introduction shows he has not understood them. Why did the publishers get Mr. Cole to write the foreword, seeing that he holds that the Marxian theory of value is "not worth preserving to-day"? No evidence whatever is brought against the correctness of the labour theory of value as explained by Marx.

A NEW "MATERIALISM."

On page xviii, Mr. Cole "explains" the materialist conception of history as follows:

"Marx's materialism is not materialistic in the sense that it excludes the action of mind, but only that it seeks its reality in this world of men and things, and not in any universe of ideas transcending this world and its limitations." Any student of Marx will see that Mr. Coles' "wide" definition is not a definition of Marx's historical materialism at all. In fact, any idealist, positivist, or other believer in ideal forces can agree with Cole, and be entirely opposed to the view that material conditions are the real foundations of social change.

MARX'S CONTRIBUTION.

Mr. Cole says: "There is nothing specifically Marxian about Marx's theory of value; what is novel is the use to which he puts the theory, and not the theory itself."

In actual fact, Marx took the labour theory of Adam Smith, Ricardo, etc., (the implications of which had not been seen by them), clarified it, applied it to the commodity labour-power, and related it to an exhaustive analysis of the actual labour process under Capitalism.

Wherever a previous Economist had

made a similar point to Marx credit was always given, but Marx's work teems with criticism of the fathers of political economy. In the "Histories of Surplus Value," by Marx, edited by Karl Kautsky, there is a storehouse of information, showing the limitations of Adam Smith and his school of thought.

On page 22 Mr. Cole writes as though Marx accepted the "Iron Law of Wages," of Ricardo, etc., which was a mixture of Malthus' overpopulation theory with economics. Marx specifically rejected this so-called law of wages, together with the false laws of population of Malthus.

The cream of Mr. Cole's pedantic introduction is his statement that "it is fully possible to hold the theory of Surplus Value without holding the Labour theory of Value, on which superficially it appears to depend" (page xxiii).

Marx's theory of Surplus Value is simply the logical result of the theory of value. Without the value theory there is no basis in Economics for surplus value.

Unless socially necessary labour time is the measure of value, there is no evidence of surplus value. The difference between the value of labour power, bought by the capitalist, and the value produced by that same labour power—that is surplus value.

WHAT IS THE NEW THEORY OF VALUE?

Among the many statements of Mr. Cole's to prejudice, mystify or confuse the reader of "Capital" is this: "By all economists, save the Marxists, the Labour theory has long been discarded." This would imply that another theory has taken its place. What is the new theory which has replaced Marx?

The entire information we get from Mr. Cole is this. "All modern theories—if we may still leave the Marxists aside for the moment—are very far removed from the 'amount of labour' theory which Marx took over from Ricardo and McCulloch.

"How, then, does it happen that the Marxists have gone on for quite half a century re-affirming Marx's views, and wholly unshaken by all the criticism that orthodox economists have been able to bring against them?"

What have these criticisms been? One economist, the father of the entire modern capitalist school, Bohm Bawerk, said that Marx ignored scarcity as a factor in value.

Actually Marx had dealt with the scarcity factor in the first few pages of "Capital." The other capitalist "economists" of note, Jevons, Marshall, Seligman, etc., took refuge in supply and demand, as their answer to Marx, but as supply and demand only accounted for fluctuations, the central point around which variations took place was still left unexplained.

"Final Utility" and "Marginal Utility" were the modern theories of supply and demand which evaded the determinant of value.

DID MARX GIVE UP HIS THEORY OF VALUE?

Mr. Cole does not tell us where Marx's theory of Value is wrong. He resorts to an old device of stating that in the third volume (Capitalist Production as a whole), Marx admitted that values of articles do not coincide with prices.

Readers of Engels' Preface to the second volume of "Capital" will be familiar with this argument. Engels challenged the critics of Marx to do something neither Ricardo or his followers could accomplish—to explain how the rates of profits in the various industries are equalised on the basis of the law of value.

Engels told the economic writers that the answer would be given in the third volume of "Capital." It was. And the problem which proved insoluble to Ricardo was solved.

Mr. Cole may claim that the Labour theory of value has been given up by Marx because he agreed that market prices did not agree with the value of articles sold. Mr. Cole has not dealt with Marx's explanation and, therefore, in spite of all the critics who have come and gone, Marx's theory of value still remains to be answered.

On the question of value and prices we will quote from one who *studied* Marx's economics, and wrote the best popular guide to Marxian Economics which has been published—Karl Kautsky's "The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx."

The opponents of the Marxian theory of value are fond of asserting that Marx himself threw overboard his own theory, which he developed in the first volume of "Capital," in the third volume, in which he demonstrates that, in consequence of the tendency towards an equalisation of profits under developed capitalist commodity production, the prices of most commodities permanently deviate from their values, inasmuch as the prices of one half of these commodities are permanently as much below their values as those

of the other half are above them. But Marx would have thrown overboard his theory of value only if he had contended that prices are independent of their values. Far from doing this, the third volume of "Capital" proves rather that production prices, about which market prices oscillate, remain in complete dependence upon the law of value, without which they cannot be explained. It is precisely the factor of the average profit, which causes the deviations of production prices from values, that can only be explained by the laws of surplus-value, which in their turn arise from those of value.

A. KOHN.

IS THE "MANUAL" WORKER THE ONLY "PRODUCER"?

A book recommended by the translators of Marx's "Capital" (E. and C. Paul) is the Marxian Economic Handbook, by W. H. Emmett. This is one of the books supposed to simplify Marx, but it makes Marx more difficult than it is supposed to be. It contains also many errors. The author was prominent at one time in the Socialist Labour Party in Australia, and seems anxious to attack De Leon's explanation of Marx's "theories."

Dealing with that fine chapter of Marx on "Co-operation," Mr. Emmett says:

In a pamphlet entitled "Marx on Mallock," Daniel de Leon implies that, according to Marx, managers and superintendents, by virtue of their brain work, are productive of wealth. (P.343.)

Mr. Emmett quotes Marx but leaves out the essential quotation. The advantages of division of labour and the necessary co-operation of producers in the modern factory are well brought out by Marx, who explains the necessity of "directive labour" in the following words:—

Labour that is directly social, community labour on a large scale, always stands more or less in need of guidance, of a management which can establish harmony among the individual activities, and fulfil the general functions that belong to the movement of the unified productive organism as contrasted with the movements of the independent organs out of which the organism is made up. An individual violinist manages his own affairs; an orchestra needs a conductor. This function of guidance, superintendence, and arrangement devolves upon capital as soon as the labour subordinated to it becomes co-operative. As a specific function of capital, the function of management acquires special characteristics ("Capital," page 346 Everyman Ed.)

Mr. Emmett makes the following statement:—

If the increased yield of modern wealth be not the exclusive yield of the manual labour employed, then this will mean that the labourers' productive power is not (neither individually nor collectively) increased at all by the co-operation. (Page 343.)

The co-operation of workers does increase the output by means of the co-operative method in production, but does that mean that the work of foremen, superintendents, etc., in directing the division of labour and the co-operation of the various parts of the process, does not play a part in the increased output?

Mr. Emmett fails to take note of Marx's point in the quotation we give.

Marx clearly shows that the functions of guidance, superintendence and arrangement are essential to the co-operative labour process.

Mr. Emmett makes a further point. He says:—

If the managers and overlookers were a part of the co-operation (or that "collective power that resides in the manual workers and their direction, collectively") how could Marx tell us that, "while the work is being done" these managers, etc., "command in the name of the capitalist" (Page 343.)

Naturally, under capitalism the foremen, managers, etc., command in the capitalists' name, but does that mean that they do not perform an essential part of the producing process? Marx clearly shows that management acquires "special characteristics" to-day, because of the "twofold nature" of production, "being, on the one hand, a social labour process intended to produce use-values, and, on the other hand, a process for promoting the self-expansion of Capital, a process for making surplus value." ("Capital," page 348.)

That two-fold character of modern production explains why the foremen, superintendents, etc., of industry are essential to the increased production of wealth in social production, and also "command in the name of the capitalist" for the purpose of producing more surplus value.

A. KOHN.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153½, Blackfriars Road, S.E.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL ORGANISATION.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND ACTION.

The Socialist Party hold that both economic and political organisation of labour are necessary. The class struggle is neither purely political nor purely economic, but involves both lines of action. That follows from the nature of the class struggle which arises from the conflict of interests between the working class and the employing class.

Economic organisation is a part of the inevitable defence of workers' interests in selling their working power to the employers. The class position of the workers naturally compels them to organise to protect their interests. The class struggle arises on the economic field, and is seen in the conflicts always going on between the workers and their masters.

LIMITS OF ECONOMIC ACTION.

The necessary fights over hours and wages are inseparable from the wages system. The efforts to raise wages and shorten hours, and the employers' opposition cannot be abolished while there is one class selling its labour power and another class who buy it.

The rapid development of modern industry with its improved machinery and methods steadily tends to throw an increasing number out of work to compete for jobs. The combination and trustification of employers into huge firms and alliances is another of the great factors in defeating the workers' struggle in industry. It is clearly seen to-day that Karl Marx was right when he pointed out that "in its merely economic action capital is the stronger side." ("Value, Price and Profit.")

WHERE STRIKES FAIL.

The weakness of all economic action by the workers lies in the fact that they have no power over production and no control of the means and instruments by which production is carried on. The economic struggles are limited to efforts within this economic system to better their daily working conditions as wage-slaves. After even the most successful strike, the workers have to go back to work for the employers and depend upon the employers' consent and power to employ them. No matter

what wages and working conditions may be gained, the workers will never be free from the necessity of finding masters and being exploited, while the masters are left in possession of the resources of production.

The essential thing, therefore, is for the workers to enter into possession of the means and instruments of production and distribution of wealth—the land, railways, factories, machinery, etc. The common ownership of these by the entire society of workers is the only remedy for the workers' slave condition.

Economic action can never enable the workers to take control of the means of life because economic organisation has neither the power nor the machinery to take and maintain possession.

WHY THE EMPLOYERS ARE SUPREME.

The employers do not rely upon their ownership alone, but their ownership is backed up and maintained by the forces of the State. These State forces are controlled by the employers through their possession of political power. In all countries with constitutions like Great Britain those who control a majority in Parliament control the State, and have charge of all the armed forces of repression and the legal machinery of the country. The employing class to-day are put into political control by the votes of the workers, who with their majority of votes elect Conservative, Liberal or Labour agents of Capitalism. This economic system is kept in existence because in their ignorance the working class use their political power to make the employing class masters of the State machine.

HOW THE WORKERS ARE DEFEATED.

In the last "General Strike," and even in smaller struggles, the property and wealth of the employers were protected by all the armed forces of the State. Economic or industrial organisations of the workers are, therefore, rendered unable to take possession of the factories, etc.—they are faced with the fact that the political machine dominates the entire situation and that the State forces are used to defend capitalist ownership against the workers.

Strike action—local or general, industrial or craft—does not enable the workers to become the owning class and end the system. Strikes, however general they

A LOOK-ROUND.

PROSPERITY IN AMERICA!

That successor to Samuel Gompers, Mr. Wm. Green (the president of the American Federation of Labour), writes in the *Daily Herald* (March 8th) on High Wages in U.S.A. Mr. Green gets High Wages, like his fellow Labour Leaders, but doesn't refer to that. He says that the principles for which they contended in their unions—high wages—is now accepted American practice. But his whole article is a series of admissions of the futility of a "high wage" policy to assure any security or well-being to workers under Capitalism. Firstly, he tells us how obliging the American workers are:

In industries where trade unions are an established agency, they have added to protective functions responsibility for helping to solve problems of production, such as finding more efficient methods of work, the most economic use of materials, higher quality standards, regularising work and the number of work days.

Testimony as to the practical value of this kind of co-operation was given to the convention by the president of the Canadian National Railways.

So not only are the workers exploited, but they assist the employers to find ways to do it better. The "directive ability" of the employer about which we hear so much is assisted by the advice of the workers.

* * *

WHERE THE COTTON BLOOMS.

The Capitalists of the Northern States have found it more profitable to have cotton spun in the South, where it is grown—for there "labour" is cheap. About this Mr. Green says:

During the past ten years rapid industrialisation of the South has come from textile mills seeking "cheap" labour in our Southern States, which have been slowly overcoming the economic handicaps of civil war between the States in the '60's.

Long hours in mills operating night as well as day shifts and employing child labour also, mill villages controlled by the textile companies and paying low wages, have exploited Southern workers.

They were driven to revolt last spring by work orders that more than doubled their work but decreased their pay.

These workers have been left to their "fate" by the American Federation of Labour, who supported Capitalist Politics while all the forces of law and State were used to smash their strike.

are, leave the employers in possession. They may dislocate industry, and even paralyse it—but paralysis of industry is not the object of the Socialist, and does not mean the control of production. To establish Socialism the workers must be able to continue production and produce the everyday requirements of the workers.

CAN YOU LOCK OUT EMPLOYING CLASS?

The slogan—lock out the bosses—which is used sometimes, is similar in its futility to a general strike. It may, for the time being, leave the workers in charge of a factory, but does not give them power over the entire economic system of production and distribution without which the workers are helpless.

Factory workers in Italy who tried the "lock out the boss" policy to enforce wage demands found that they could not eat the products of their factory—automobiles, etc. They had to either sell them or get into contact with the other producers, in order to live. The armed forces of the Italian State were able both to eject the "stay in strikers" and make it impossible for them to organise production and distribution in common with the rest of the workers of Italy.

POLITICAL ACTION THE ONLY WAY.

The lesson, then, is for the working class to understand their class interests and organise as a class into a political party of Socialists to control political power, and thus control the armed forces of the State.

Having obtained control of these forces the workers can continue production for themselves—socialise the means of production and distribution, and secure themselves against aggression.

Strikes and other economic action may win temporary concessions, but no economic action can establish common ownership. That is the function of political action.

The common objections against political action, and some of the arguments in favour of economic action will be considered in another article.

C.

WANTED: A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*.

Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months.

THE SCRAP HEAP.

In that "happy land" of rationalised industry—which is the ideal of industrial reformers here—Mr. Green confesses that only young workers are wanted.

Another problem which the convention considered was discrimination against workers over 45 years of age. The speed of machine production is assumed to require young workers.

This idea, together with protective features which compensation laws, old age pensions or insurance plans provide for wage earners, has developed a prejudice against the middle-aged workers because of additional costs their greater liability is supposed to bring to industry.

"The speed of machine industry" wants the nimble hands of the young—hence the future is black while the machine is owned by the employers. The last paragraph quoted above shows that when reforms cost the employers' money they reduce their liability by sacking those most liable to accident and those who would need to be pensioned.

* * *

NOT OVER 25 YEARS OF AGE.

How quickly workers are used up in modern developed industry is evident from Mr. Green:

The Federation has collected information which shows that some large corporations refuse to employ workers over 35 years of age, and in some cases as low as 25 years.

The general trend towards decreasing employment opportunity to middle-aged workers increases the difficulties of providing for incomes for old age.

In addition we have the problem of workers displaced by machinery and technical changes, so that skills which have been developed through years of work are no longer of any value in production. The resulting so-called technical unemployment is very hard on older workers.

* * *

WHAT A REMEDY!

After these remarks on "High Wages" in America, the leader of the American Unions tells us that the remedy for the conditions is to remove them from the arena of conflict to the Conference Table! He also advises the workers to practise "greater output."

Nearly 30 years ago the American Labour Leaders formed the Civic Federation to get together with Employers "round the table." And the result can be seen in Mr. Green's own admissions to-day.

22 per cent. of organised Labour in U.S.A. is unemployed according to the

Federation of Labour (*Daily Herald*, March 4th). What is the unions' remedy? More Capitalism. Mr. Ford says high wages are the remedy, but he wants other employers to pay high wages so that their workers can buy his motor-cars. When he announced higher wages for his employees he forgot to add that short time was general in his "shops" and that along with the extra dollar a day a greater speeding up of the machine slaves went on. High wages did not prevent his factories closing down many departments recently and when they restarted the pace was increased.

The land of high wages! The Secretary of Labour recently complained that 2 million workers were getting 1s. 3d. (30 cents) per hour or less. (*New York Telegram*).

That means practically a starvation wage in a land with a high cost of living.

But more machinery is coming!

The New York Post (November 18th) says that machinery in industry, mining and farming has displaced 2,300,000 in the last 8 years in the U.S.A.

The lesson for the workers is to own the machines and produce for use.

* * *

THE FRUITS OF RATIONALISATION IN BRITAIN.

"There are 153,000 building workers unemployed." (Chiozza Money, *Daily Herald*, February 27th.)

"There are 200,000 miners who will never work underground again." (Tom Smith, M.P., of Department of Mines, *Daily Herald*, February 27th.)

"Some colliery companies laid it down that when they wanted fresh hands no men over 45 need apply." (Same speaker.)

We were told that the dilution of labour in the building trade would provide work by making houses cheaper. Now after all the dilution there is vast unemployment. The Labour Party are rationalising mines, closing down uneconomic pits, and combining the others with the result that the 200,000 miners "out of work" will be added to. Rationalisation means efficiency in industry and the older men not wanted as they have been "worked out."

* * *

By the "aid" of the Banks the shipyards have combined into a huge trust, "National Shipbuilders Security, Ltd.," and the banks will see that before loans are issued the un-

necessary yards and smaller plants are closed down.

Beardmore's recently dispensed with 600 men on the Clyde at Parkhead as their amalgamation with David Colville, Ltd., made that plant unnecessary. Mr. Brownlie, of the Engineering Union, said:

"I think the shipbuilders are adopting the right policy in dispensing with the obsolete and unnecessary shipyards and reducing overhead and administration charges."

This capitalist view of a trade union leader quoted in the *Daily Herald* (March 1st) contrasts with the view from the same paper of the representative of the Shipwrights' Society, who said, "the scheme was one of the worst things which could happen to the employees." We are assured by this "Labour" paper that the scheme is largely "a financial one," which means, of course, a financier's one. A scheme to assure profits to the detriment of wages and employment.

* * *

MORE WORK—FEWER MEN REQUIRED.

How true the Socialist view of rationalisation is, can be gathered from the figures given by the *Daily Herald*—the supporter of rationalisation and the Labour Government.

Dealing with the Iron Ore industry in Cumberland, it states that last year was the most productive since the war, output totalling 1,050,000 tons. The next best was 1922 with 868,000 tons. But last year's output was from 10 mines, while in 1922 it came from 30. "Moreover, the number of employees is half the total of a few years ago. The explanation lies chiefly in the increased use of machinery." And the "Herald" adds that the volume of unemployment in the industry is very serious, and that the position has worsened since the beginning of the year.

25 per cent. of the Lancashire cotton workers are unemployed and over 5 million spindles are permanently idle, and a large number more are only used on short time. Such are the conditions in the highly developed industry—the backbone of British Export Trade. Now they form a huge combine and fewer mills than ever will be required.

The Labour leaders agreed to a reduction in wages of 1s. 3d. in the £, and the employers argued that a reduction in wages would mean more employment for cotton operatives. After several months of reduced

wages they are faced with more unemployment than before.

In the weaving branch the employers are rationalising with a vengeance. Mills are being equipped with "up to date" looms; 8 looms per weaver instead of four. Thus the process of speeding up production means more output by fewer employed, and all the time the output is increased the market for it declines. With a view to using the most efficient machinery continuously the masters are advocating the two shift system as in America, but it has not saved the New England mill workers from unemployment.

* * *

We learn from the *Daily Express* that 120 drivers and conductors have been dismissed by the London Bus Combine. These men were taken over from the independent companies when the Labour Government's Traffic Act gave the Combine the control of the London buses. The men were dismissed after medical examination and have no prospect of other employment. The London General Omnibus Company is "fully rationalised" and Lord Ashfield, the director, sees that when the Company pays its "union wage" he gets the goods. They took over the rival bus company's buses, but the men were not reckoned to be able to stand the terrific physical and mental strain of working the profit hunting bus of the Combine with its merciless exploitation under "high wages." So here again—combination of capital plays havoc with the worker. No wonder the Minister of Transport (Mr. Morrison) described his own Government's bill as one of the worst bills ever passed through Parliament.

K.

GIFT TO LIBRARY.

We have received from Comrade Stevens, "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire."

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday	Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1 8 p.m. Clapham Common, 3 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 3 p.m. East Street, Walworth, 11.30 a.m. Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m.
Tuesday	Bricklayers' Arms, 7.30 p.m.
Wednesday	Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Pringe of Wales, 8 p.m.
Saturday	Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. E. McHaffie. Communications to Secretary, S.P.G.B., c/o 141 Bow Road. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at above address. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 99, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. as above.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets Thursdays 8 p.m. at 44, Edgedale Road. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 309. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, MAY, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

LABOUR PARTY LEADERS MAKE UNEMPLOYMENT.

Nearly eleven years ago, in the autumn of 1919, the hoardings of this country were plastered with posters bearing the familiar features of Messrs. J. R. Clynes, J. H. Thomas, John Hodge, and J. T. Brownlie. They were exhorting us to "produce more, earn more and get more." Each in his own words elaborated this little slogan in order to induce the workers to work harder.

Mr. J. R. Clynes, M.P., explained that a "greater yield of commodities is essential in order that an abundance of products should pull down prices and place upon the market all the things which are necessary for improved housing, cheaper food and clothing, of which the workers are in urgent need." He added that he urged the workers "to turn their minds to improved systems of production, primarily in the interests of the workers themselves."

Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., said, "more and more we are coming to understand that if we are to avoid bankruptcy and national ruin, agreements must be kept and production increased"; and again, "I urge the working classes to realise the necessity of having the wheels of industry going well."

Mr. John Hodge, M.P., wrote "in sorrow and pain" at the thought that workers might be led astray by the doctrines of revolutionaries. If the workers did not increase output, then, said Mr. Hodge, they would be "workless and wageless."

Other "labour leaders" preaching the same doctrine were Philip Snowden (in the official organ of the I.L.P.), Mr. Bevin and Mr. W. Brace.

We did not accept the economic theories of the labour leaders and the employers, nor did we believe their promises of future prosperity for the workers. We held the increased production campaign to be opposed to working class interests, and said so. Our temerity called forth an indignant reply from Mr. Clynes in the columns of *Reynolds' Newspaper* on November 30th, 1919.

CLYNES AMONG THE PROPHETS

Mr. Clynes based his case there on the statement that "greater production can be brought about without any benefit to the master class, but with great benefit to the working class. Even if it did give some benefit to some employers, it would give far greater benefit to many employees."

He went on to make a prophecy:—

If there ever was a risk of over-production, causing unemployment, there is none now. For at least a dozen years there must be conditions of shortage which, with the best energy and effort, cannot be removed. We are in arrears. We need have no fear of the supply exceeding the demand.

Let us now see what time has done with the "theories," the promises, and the prophecies of these trusted leaders of labour.

Mr. Clynes promised that prices would be "pulled down." Were they?

In October, 1919, prices were 125% above the 1914 level (Ministry of Labour Cost of Living Index). By October, 1920, they had risen enormously and were 164% above the 1914 level.

Eventually prices came down again, but did this result in the workers getting

the improved housing and cheaper food and clothing, of which, in Mr. Clynes' words, they were "in urgent need"? Prices fell, but wages came down correspondingly and the need of the workers is as urgent as ever it was.

J. H. Thomas wanted the workers to realise the necessity of "having the wheels of industry going well"; but neither he, nor Clynes could answer our criticism that the "wheels of industry" belong to the master class and are permitted to turn only when the master class choose to have them turning. It was not greater production as such, but greater profits the employers wanted, and as soon as their interests demanded it they were sacking the workers by the hundred thousand and reducing wages by an aggregate of hundreds of millions of pounds a year. This is what we foretold and what Clynes denied.

Clynes promised "at least a dozen years" of full employment. What actually happened? The destruction of war, far from taking twelve years to replace, did not require that number of months.

At the time Mr. Clynes wrote his article there were already over half a million registered unemployed (19th September, 1919, 530,336. See Ministry of Labour Gazette, October, 1919).

By the middle of 1921 the number of unemployed was well over the two millions, excluding workers on short-time.

Since then the figure has never fallen materially below the million line and now it is at a million and a half.

John Hodge said that the workers would be "workless and wageless" if they did not increase output. So they increased output, and one and a half million are—"workless and wageless."

Clynes was certain that "we need have no fear of the supply exceeding the demand." In a sense he is correct; the employers have got busy organising among themselves to see that the supply shall not exceed the demand of the market at prices profitable to them. Read what the *Manchester Guardian* has to say in its editorial on February 10th, under the heading "Overproduction—the Demon to be exorcised."

Schemes for restricting the output of rubber are old friends, but the latest version is a joint Anglo-Dutch restrictive campaign. The tea-

growers of Ceylon, India, and Java have been in conclave. The tin producers of Malay have conferred with those of Bolivia, and the wheat-growers of Canada . . . have sought alliances not only in the U.S.A. but in Argentina. We understand that near Sydney, Australia, there is a spot at which the carts of a retailing trust may be observed tipping cartloads of good food over a cliff into the sea.

It is interesting to notice that J. H. Thomas has finally admitted that over-production is a reality under capitalism.

Speaking at a luncheon given by the Nottingham District of the Federation of British Industries on March 20th, 1930, he said:—

Curiously enough one of the great anomalies at that moment was that the main cause of the world depression, as well as our own, was over-production. How many of them would challenge him when he said that over-production of cotton was playing a more disastrous part in our unemployed and industrial position than any other? (*Times*, March 22nd, 1930.)

Clynes appears to have learned nothing in the intervening years; either that or he feels confident of his ability to feed the workers for ever on promises. In 1919 he was helping the employers to swell their profits by preaching increased production. Now he is repeating the old trick but uses the new-fangled term, "rationalisation." In a speech at Miles Platting on February 9th, 1930 (reported in the *Manchester Guardian* on February 10th), he admitted that rationalisation increases the amount of unemployment; but nevertheless urged the workers to bear it with patience "because it was a kind of surgery that was being applied to industry, and after it industry would rise stronger and better able to compete with the world."

In 1919 he promised 12 years full employment. After 11 years of unemployment at a height unknown before, he has the impudence to urge the workers to be patient while the employing class in this country make their position more secure and their profits more vast.

In 1919 we said that Socialism alone could solve the economic problems of the workers. Thomas, Clynes, and the rest of the labour leaders counselled co-operation with the employers in the running of the capitalist system. That is still their only policy. H.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

POINTS FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

WHOSE SAVINGS?

At frequent intervals we are reminded by capitalist apologists of the sums of money owned by workers and deposited in Savings Banks and similar institutions. The amounts themselves, although large in the aggregate, represent only a small fraction of the amounts owned by the capitalist minority of the population, and those who accept the figures have never attempted to show that the savings in question really do belong to members of the working class. Now comes Mr. T. S. Ashton, Reader in Currency and Finance at Manchester University, and shows that, in the main, they do not. The information was given by him in a paper which he read on Wednesday, January 15th, to the Manchester Statistical Society, reported in the *Manchester Guardian* on the following day (January 16th, 1930). Mr. Ashton agreed that the majority of the Post Office Savings Bank and Trustee Savings Bank accounts are held by workers, but he then showed that the total deposits, on the other hand, are largely concentrated in a few accounts held by non-workers. In 1919 four Trustee Savings Banks analysed their accounts with the following results: At Kirkcaldy, 60 per cent. of the depositors had deposits averaging less than £10 per head, and all their deposits together amounted to less than one twentieth part of the total deposits; 82 per cent. of the depositors held together only a little over a quarter of the total deposits.

At Paisley, 10,000 depositors owned together only 3 per cent. of the deposits (£32,000), while 700 large depositors held £764,000, including holding of stock.

Mr. Ashton stated that the position with regard to Post Office Savings Banks is similar to that of the Trustee Savings Banks, and there has been no essential change since 1919. The *Manchester Guardian* accepts Mr. Ashton's conclusions.

* * *

LABOUR GOVERNMENT WAITING FOR "PROSPERITY."

We have asked when the Labour Government intend to provide the benefits which it promised to give to the workers in the shape of social reforms. Mr. Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer, has answered the question.

He gave a wireless broadcast on April 15th and his address was reported in the *Daily Telegraph* on the following day. He said:—

I have held all my life that the happiness of the people can be vastly improved by great schemes of social reform and national reconstruction. I believe that the distribution of the national wealth calls for reform. I believe also that *these vital improvements are only possible out of revived and prosperous industry from which our national revenue is derived. (Italics ours.)*

But the only respect in which industry, as a whole, is unprosperous is in respect of the poverty of the workers—both employed and unemployed.

The employing class collectively have never been other than prosperous, and the workers have never been other than poor.

All, then, that Mr. Snowden offers is a promise to help the workers at some time unspecified when they are prosperous and will not need help.

We would add that capitalism, whether left to its own devices or aided by the Labour Government, will never bring about that result.

* * *

MARX VERSUS MAXTON.

Mr. Maxton, Chairman of the I.L.P., is pleased on occasion to describe himself as a Marxist in spite of his transparent ignorance of Marxian theories.

The disservice he does to Socialist propaganda is well illustrated by a statement made by him in debate with the Hon. Oliver Stanley, M.P. In this debate, reported in the *Daily Herald* on 27th February, 1930, Mr. Maxton made the assertion that "the manual workers produced the real wealth, and it was produced in no other way."

Although his attention was drawn to this in a letter which the *Herald* published a few days later, Mr. Maxton did not question the accuracy of the report.

His statement was seized upon by the daily press and use was made of it to ridicule Marx. The *Daily Express* in particular published a letter from a correspondent denouncing Mr. Maxton's statement as an "absurd Marxian doctrine" (the *Daily Express*, 5th March). A letter to the *Daily Express* pointing out that Marx quite clearly rejects the view attributed to him was not published, but a day or two later the *Daily Express* inserted another letter repeating the untruth.

Marx deals with the question in Capital, Vol. I., Chapter IV., section 3 ("Purchase and Sale of Labour Power"). He wrote:—

I use the term labour power or capacity for labour to denote the aggregate of those bodily and mental capabilities existing in a human being, which he exercises whenever he produces a use-value of any kind. (Capital: Allen & Unwin Edition, page 154.)

It is a pity that Mr. Maxton cannot give his errors some other label.

* * *

IS PARLIAMENT TOO SLOW?

It is often urged that Parliament as a machine is too unwieldy and slow. This criticism is usually based upon the disappointing results of legislation when judged from the standpoint of some or other group of electors. The critics forget that the failure of those who control the parliamentary machine to do something for the workers is not evidence of defective machinery, but of lack of intention. Even if the machine is at present defective, those who control it can always alter it if the electors want it altered.

General Seeley has, however, recently disclosed how speedy Parliament can be when those who control it really want it to be speedy.

General Seeley was Secretary of State for War in 1912, and in view of the anticipated war with Germany, Sir John French and Sir Henry Wilson wanted an increase in the Secret Service Fund and the passing of a more stringent Official Secrets' Act. They wanted the Bill passed through all its stages in one sitting. The Speaker of the House of Commons (Mr. Lowther) and the Clerk of the House said it was "contrary to every Parliamentary precedent and to every principle of sound government." Nevertheless, it was done and the Bill was introduced, put through its second reading and its Committee stage, and given the Royal assent, all within 24 hours (having previously passed the Lords). Two or three M.P.'s, who tried to speak on the Bill were pulled down by their coat tails.

General Seeley's disclosures are made in his book of reminiscences, "Adventure" (Published by Heinemann's, 21/-).

* * *

BOMBS ARE CHEAP.

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE AIR FORCE.

A debate took place in the House of Lords on April 9th on the use of the Air

Force for "police" work in the outlying parts of the Empire.

"Police" work is a polite way of describing the forcible suppression of native races who resent British rule.

In the debate military and naval authorities raised objections to the use of the Royal Air Force for this purpose. The Earl of Cavan and Viscount Plumer raised the amusing objection that bombing from the air "hurts guilty and innocent alike" and "leaves bitterness behind" (*Daily Telegraph*, 10th April). It has remained for these military men to discover that high explosive shells fired many miles away are cute enough to select the "guilty" victims and leave the "innocent" untouched.

The Labour Party's Minister for Air, Lord Thomson, defended his policy.

As an airman he ridiculed the naval and military arguments on the inhumanity of air warfare. He could not see the inhumanity of a bomb as compared with a shell. The question for him was efficiency and cheapness, and if the bomb satisfied that test he was for the bomb. (*Daily Telegraph*, April 10.)

* * *

THE BENEFITS OF CAPITALIST CIVILISATION.

Mr. H. J. Greenwall, special correspondent of the *Daily Express* in Morocco, has been writing up the benefits which the French occupation has brought to the poor, untutored Moors. The work of the French is based, he says, upon "what Great Britain had accomplished in other climes" (*Daily Express*, 10th April, 1930).

The French have abolished slavery. "Before the French conquest of Morocco the slave trade flourished, and in some parts of this country there were what might be literally termed slave studs, where slaves were bred by the pashas of the cities for sale. Since the French established a protectorate here there have been no public slave markets. Slaves may be freed on their own request."

Now that the bad old days of slavery have been abolished by the chivalrous French capitalist, the Moors have entered into a new and better world, not only the men, but also the children.

Labour, of course, is very cheap, and the exploitation of child labour in some industries takes one's breath away. I visited a carpet factory here. . . . the first thing that struck me was the number of tiny children, from eight to twelve years of age, working in the factory, sitting in front of the looms. They are paid per knot, and

their baby fingers make knots in the twinkling of an eye.

The fathers were so unappreciative of capitalist civilisation that they resisted the French troops. It is to be hoped that the children will some day appreciate the value of being kept out of mischief from the age of eight, and saved from slavery in order to sit at a loom in a factory.

* * *

WEALTH AND DIRECTIVE ABILITY.

The *Daily Express* correspondent in New York tells an interesting story about the relationship between the wealth and the alleged superior brains of the capitalist class. (See *Daily Express*, 18th March, 1930.)

Mrs. Ida A. Flagler is the widow of the late Mr. Henry M. Flagler. He left his money to her, but she had the misfortune to become insane and was sent to a mental home in 1898. She then had property worth £200,000. This property has in the meantime grown in value to the enormous sum of £3,219,000 and her income alone is £125,000 a year.

As the *Daily Express* correspondent cannot in this case attribute the increase to its owner's "directive ability" he calls it a "natural growth." When we find nature-given material transforming itself by "natural growth" into food, clothing, houses, ships, motor-cars, etc., without the expenditure of mental and physical energies by the workers who at present carry on industry, we shall be prepared to share the *Daily Express* correspondent's belief in the miraculous power of money to multiply itself. Until then, we shall continue to believe, in accordance with the facts of everyday experience, that the wealth of the rich is produced by the brains and brawn of the working class.

H.

You should read . . .

'THE SOCIALIST'

Organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.)

Obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office).

Price 3d. per copy, post free; or 3/6 a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

A COMMENTARY ON THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.

The Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels with an introduction and notes by D. Ryazanoff, Director of the Marx-Engels Institute, Moscow. Published by Martin Lawrence, Bedford Row, London, W.C., 15/-. (Special cheap edition, 6/-, obtainable through this office.)

This work is the summary of lectures given in Russia by the head of the Marx-Engels Institute during 1921 and 1922. The book takes the form of a re-translation of the Communist Manifesto into English by Eden and Cedar Paul, and a series of historical and other notes commenting on the persons, events and policies dealt with in the manifesto itself. It includes a chronology of events in the "working class" movements from 1516-1871. The draft of a proposed manifesto for the Communist League by Frederick Engels, and also the Rules and Constitution of the League are reprinted in the book.

Two very interesting articles by Engels on the Communist League and the Revolutionary Movements of 1847, are given for the first time in English. There is also a reprint of a trial number of the Communist Journal of September, 1847, which was to be the London organ of the Workers' Educational Society, a body with whom Marx and Engels were associated.

THE NEW TRANSLATION OF THE MANIFESTO.

Eden and Cedar Paul's translation of the Communist manifesto is certainly no improvement on the authorised edition published in England by Reeves, translated by Samuel Moore, and revised by Engels. The language used by the new translators is not as simple and clear as the old. One or two examples will illustrate the curious efforts of the translators to use new and strange words in place of the easier and more popular English of the old translation. The new translation refers to the bourgeoisie and proletariat as "two great and directly contraposed classes," whereas in the Reeves' edition we have "two great classes directly facing each other." In place of "political sway" in the Reeves' edition, Eden and Cedar Paul put "political hegemony." In the old translation the manifesto refers to the "scattered state of the population," etc., but the new translation prefers to use such a difficult, ugly word as "fractionisation." Where the Reeves' edition talks of "the abolition of

existing property relations," the Pauls say, "pre-existent property relations." In another paragraph we get the formal lawyer-like language, "pre-existent private proprietary securities" to replace "previous securities for, and insurances of individual property." Where the old translation refers to the wage-labourer, the new one adopts the harder phrase, "the proletarianised worker." Many similar instances could be quoted to show that the translators have forgotten that this great historic manifesto was written for the working class and that the language should be as simple as possible. In one place where Marx refers to Communism abolishing the *bourgeois* family, the new translation makes Communism abolish the family!

Ryazanoff, however, is not responsible for the translation. In the Russian edition of his work he used Plechanoff's translation of the manifesto.

THE COMMENTARY ON THE MANIFESTO.

The lengthy notes to illustrate and explain characters and events will be very useful for the student. Marx's "Capital," and also his "Poverty of Philosophy," are drawn upon for quotations to help the reader. Engels' "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844," is much quoted by Ryazanoff to furnish the historical background of the manifesto in England.

The author of this work states that it is not the commentary on the manifesto that is really needed, but time has not permitted a more suitable work. His view as to what a commentary should be is quite correct and he hopes to be able to write a fuller work in the future. What the student needs is a history of the previous "Communist" and allied movements and a history of the Early "Socialist" theories, together with a study of the class struggles prevailing.

The manifesto is a historical work and can be best understood with a knowledge of the social and historical conditions that led up to it. The notes given by Ryazanoff will be useful as an outline.

There are many extracts from little known writings of Marx and Engels now translated for the first time in this book. Some of them on Christianity, Law, etc., will be reproduced in the SOCIALIST STANDARD as space permits. The famous quotation containing Marx's phrase, "Religion is the opium of the people," is given from Marx's

Criticism of Hegels' "Philosophy of Rights."

PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY!

The author comments on the well-known attitude of Marx in the manifesto that the workers must first of all win political supremacy—become the ruling class by winning the battle of democracy. Ryazanoff says this must be understood as "proletarian democracy," but gives no evidence that Marx meant anything different from what he said—"democracy." Winning the battle of democracy in modern times means winning the majority of the population—which is the working class. Marx pointed out at the time in his article on Chartism (quoted in the March SOCIALIST STANDARD), that the majority of voters in England under manhood suffrage would constitute the mass of the workers who could become politically supreme if they used their votes to do so.

If the workers are to win the battle of democracy and become supreme, then it is obvious that where the working class are the majority of the nation they become supreme by using existing democracy and not waiting till a new society is already established. The statement of the author that "democracy" here means "proletarian democracy" makes nonsense of Marx's phrase, because the workers have to rise to power before they could (if they wished) disfranchise the capitalists.

DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

Ryazanoff says that though the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" is not used in the Communist manifesto the basis of it is there. He says the phrase was coined after the 1848 revolution in Paris. But he forgets that in none of the many prefaces to the manifesto which Marx and Engels wrote in later years did they use the phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat." In two writings where it was used it was simply used to mean the rule of the working class in a society not ready for Socialism. In a private letter criticising the "free people's State" Marx once used it and also in the early 'fifties in magazine articles on "Class Struggles in France." The latter were not published in book form till 1895, long after Marx's death. And it was in that work where Marx, dealing with the large peasantry and the small working class in France, said that if the workers got

power there would be a "dictatorship of the proletariat."

"The Class Struggles in France" is a review of events from 1848-1850, and the views set out there depend upon the conditions of the time. Engels, in his long introduction, shows that minority action and the violent methods, advocated at the time Marx wrote the work, had been proved wrong by history, and that social changes had transformed completely the conditions under which the workers had to struggle. Engels advocates political action and also tells us that a democratic republic affords the best conditions for political success. He did not repeat the advice about dictatorship given by Marx nearly 50 years before. In none of the published works of Marx and Engels did they lay down dictatorship as the object of a working class party. As Engels says ("Socialism: Utopian and Scientific"), the working class seizes the power of the State and at once converts the means of production into social property. Whether we examine the Communist League, the International Working Men's Association or any other body Marx was identified with; their object was always defined as the capture of political power by the working class.

Long after the Paris Commune of 1871 was over Engels wrote in the preface to Marx's "Civil War in France (1871)," that in the Paris Commune, with its universal suffrage and democracy, you could see what the dictatorship of the proletariat was like.

Finally, we suggest to the head of the Marx-Engels Institute that the "smash the State" theory which he associates with Marx and Engels has no foundation in the philosophy of Marx and Engels. The most widely read book of Engels, written with the co-operation of Marx against Duhring ("Socialism: Utopian and Scientific"), says:

"The first action undertaken by the State as genuinely representative of society at large, the seizure of the means of production in the name of society at large, is simultaneously its last independent action as a State." And he goes on to say, "The State is not 'abolished,' it dies out." (Ryazanoff translation).

Apart from the matters to which we have drawn attention, the book well deserves reading and will prove worthy of any worker's time.

One of its chief drawbacks is that it does not generally deal with the usefulness or

otherwise, to-day, of the various measures or policies advocated in the manifesto.

The book is published at 15/-, but working class bodies can have a special edition at 6/-. It really should be published in cheap covers at about 2/-, so that most workers could get it. A. KOHN.

THE WORKERS' SHARE.

("The Workers Share: A Study in Wages and Poverty," by A. W. Humphrey. Published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 92 pages, 2/6; cloth bound, 3/6.)

This little work is a compact handbook of information on the wealth and poverty which exist side by side in capitalist society.

Part I, "Evidence of Statistics of Wages and Wealth," gives facts and figures relating to wealth distribution over the past three-quarters of a century, together with the authority for the various statements.

Part II, "Evidence of Social Investigation," gives the summing-up of the poverty problem by many well-known social students: Booth, Shewell, Bell, Bowley, Rowntree, etc.

Part III, "Present-day Wages and the Poverty Line," includes an estimate based on Ministry of Labour figures of the cost in 1928 of purchasing the bare necessities of the "Rowntree" Poverty Line. The cost in March, 1928, of purchasing the articles which in July, 1914, cost 35s. 3d. (the Poverty Line) was 59s. 7d.

For contrast, the author gives particulars of the average earnings of workers in different industries. The average earnings of all male workers in industries covered by the 1924 Ministry of Labour Inquiry was 56s. 3d.

The price 2s. 6d. seems somewhat high for a work of 92 pages, but the book is a mine of information, most of it not easily accessible otherwise, and not elsewhere brought together in one handy volume. It will prove of great value to propagandists. H.

NOTICE TO READERS.

Readers are invited to send in their suggestions as to features which they would like to see in the *Socialist Standard*, and their questions to be answered. While we cannot undertake to adopt all suggestions, we shall welcome readers' proposals for increasing the effectiveness of our paper as a means of carrying on Socialist Propaganda.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *Socialist Standard*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 49, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 8d.

The Socialist Standard,

MAY,



1930

REMEMBER BELGIUM!

In 1914, hundreds of thousands of workers were duped into enlisting by the appeal to their sympathy on behalf of "poor little Belgium!" It is interesting to learn that confirmation has now been given to the statement that the Allied Governments had themselves prepared for violating Belgian "neutrality."

Mr. Harold Nicolson has just written a life of his father, Lord Carnock, who as Sir Arthur Nicholson was Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office in the years leading up to the war ("Lord Carnock," published by Constable, 21/-).

From a review of the book which appeared in the *Daily Herald* on April 3rd, 1930, we learn that in September, 1911, "preparations for landing four or six divisions on the Continent have been worked out to the minutest detail"; and in 1913 French military authorities are reported by Sir Arthur Nicolson to be of the view that "it would be far better for France if a conflict were not too long postponed."

In 1913 Sir Arthur Nicolson wrote to the Minister in Brussels:—

We and France might have to move troops across the Belgian frontier in order to meet the approach of German troops from the other side.

The *Herald* reviewer says that "The Minister's reply makes it clear that this action was contemplated before the Germans actually entered Belgium."

These statements based on Mr. Harold Nicolson's book were promptly confirmed by the Countess of Warwick in an interview which she gave the *Daily Herald* on April 4th.

She reports a conversation between Lord French and M. Clemenceau which took place in 1910, she being the only other person present, and acting as interpreter. Clemenceau said:—

... The British landing would be at Dunkirk, and your troops would go through Belgium into Germany.

French was dubious, and raised the question of Belgian neutrality, to which Clemenceau replied:—

Treaties do not matter when it comes to war.

The Countess of Warwick relates the following further facts:—

In later conversation Clemenceau stated that while the British pushed through Belgium the French would attack through Lorraine.

The conversation was private, but I wrote to King Edward, who was my friend, about it.

The Countess of Warwick then explained why she had kept this secret for so many years. She had intended to publish it in her reminiscences published six months ago, but her publishers refused to include these passages because "it put our country in a bad light."

She admits that she made no attempt to publish it earlier than 1929.

For years I bottled it up within myself, even at the time when the "poor little Belgium" talk was being used to lure thousands of poor boys to their deaths.

Then, last year, when she was publishing her own book, she "asked one or two friends what they thought, and they said that they thought it would do no harm so long after the war."

In short, the noble Lady, one of the shining lights of the I.L.P., the Labour Party, and the Social Democratic Federation, kept her mouth shut when "poor little Belgium" talk was being used to lure thousands of poor boys to their deaths, and only disclosed the secret when she thought "it would do no harm."

The number of British subjects who lost their lives in the Great War was nearly 1,100,000. In addition, thousands have been blinded, crippled or otherwise mutilated. This the Countess could stand. But she could not bear the thought of putting the "country" in a bad light, and therefore did not let the victims share her knowledge until "it would do no harm," that is, 15 years too late for it to be of use to them.

We wonder what the Countess of Warwick regards as "harm."

KARL MARX ON CHRISTIANITY.

In answer to a "Christian Socialist" who contributed to the *German Brussels Journal*, Marx wrote the following:—

"The social principles of Christianity have had eighteen centuries in which to develop, and have no need to undergo further development at the hands of Prussian consistorial councillors. The social principles of Christianity justified the slavery of classical days; they glorified mediæval serfdom; and they are able when needs must to defend the oppression of the proletariat, though with a somewhat crestfallen air. The social principles of Christianity proclaim the need for the existence of a ruling class and a subjugated class, being content to express the pious hope that the former will deal philanthropically with the latter. The social principles of Christianity assume that there will be compensation in heaven for all the infamies committed on earth, and thereby justify the persistence of these infamies here below. The social principles of Christianity explain that the atrocities perpetrated by the oppressors on the oppressed are either just punishments for original and other sins, or else trials which the Lord in His wisdom ordains for the Redeemed. The social principles of Christianity preach cowardice, self-contempt, abasement, submission, humility, in a word, all the qualities of the canaille; and the proletariat which will not allow itself to be treated as canaille, needs courage, self-confidence, pride, a sense of personal dignity and independence, even more than it needs daily bread. The social principles of Christianity are lick-spittle, whereas the proletariat is revolutionary. So much for the social principles of Christianity!

(Literary Remains, Vol. II., pp. 442-44.)

"THE OPIUM OF THE PEOPLE."

"The fact is that religion is the self-consciousness and the self-feeling of the man who has either not yet found himself or, having done so, has lost himself again. . . . Thus the struggle against Religion is a direct struggle against the world whose spiritual aroma is religion. Religious poverty is in one, the expression of real poverty, and, in another, a protest against real poverty. Religion is the sigh of a heavy laden creature, the heart of a heartless world, just as it is the spirit of spiritless conditions. It is the opium of the people. The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is a prerequisite for the attainment of real happiness by the people. . . . Thus the criticism of heaven is transformed into a criticism of earth, the criticism of theology into a criticism of politics." (Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe, Vol. I., page 607-608. Marx, Zur Kritik der Hegelischen Rechtsphilosophie.)

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

"Brusski: A Story of Peasant Life in Soviet Russia," by F. Panferov. Published by Martin Lawrence, Ltd., 300 pages, 7/6.

"Imperialism and World Economy," by N. Bukharin. Published by Martin Lawrence, Ltd., 170 pages, 6/-.

"The Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels," with an introduction and explanatory notes by D. Ryazanoff. Published by Martin Lawrence, Ltd., 6/-.

"The Workers' Share," by A. W. Humphrey. Published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 92 pages, 2/6; cloth, 3/6.

NOTICE.

We are now able to supply back numbers of the "*Socialist*" (S.E.S. of New York), from January, 1930, onwards, at 3½d. per copy, post free.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "*Socialist Standard*" can be obtained from the following Newsagents

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 86, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 189, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153½, Blackfriars Road, S.E.

SOCIALISM v. NATIONALISM.**"The History of Nationalism in the East."**

By Dr. Hans Kohn. (Routledge, 1929).

"East is East, and West is West
And never the twain shall meet."

So sang the jingo bard, Kipling; but, like most poets, he was prone to inaccurate statements. Dr. Kohn's book shows that the view quoted is as absurd historically as it is geographically. Just as surely as any line of latitude forms a circle, so it is also true that "eastern" and "western" races have acted and reacted upon one another.

In the past the Arabs and the Jews have, in different ways, influenced European development profoundly under suitable economic conditions. Since the eighteenth century dawned this development has in turn spread with rapidly accumulating force over the entire globe—"the Orient" included.

Dr. Kohn's theme is the effect of this development upon the literary, ethical, religious, and above all, political aspects of oriental existence. Not that he puts the matter quite like that. Here and there he gives unmistakable evidence of an acquaintance with the materialistic view of history, but he is far from logically applying it. On the contrary, there are times when it is a little difficult to tell whether one is reading a transcription of the mystical views of the people, whom the author describes or the author's own views on the subject. This is most noticeable in the two final chapters on "India's Awakening" and "Indian Nationalism."

Dr. Kohn is nothing if not comprehensive. Russia, Northern Africa, Turkey, Arabia, Persia, Afghanistan, India and China are all more or less thoroughly reviewed. One wishes the author had probed as deeply as he has travelled widely, at least in the literary sense. His clearest sentences are contained in his introduction on page 10. Having briefly sketched the downfall of feudalism and the rise of capitalism in Western Europe with the accompanying religious and political changes he goes on to say:—

"A similar process is repeating itself in the East. Ancient economic systems are falling into decay, modern industrialism, wholesale trade and finance capital are beginning to penetrate everywhere. The old ruling caste of landed nobility, warriors and priests is being slowly ousted by a

rising class of merchants, lawyers and men of letters. Professional men—especially lawyers and students—are protagonists of the new nationalist movement, their champions and leaders."

Unfortunately, the author does not maintain the argument on this level. He advances the theory that there are three "fellowships of common destiny," viz., the Anglo-Saxon (including the U.S.A.), the European (excluding Russia), and the Oriental. Says the Doctor (page 3):—

"The Anglo-Saxon fellowship feels and wills its unity more consciously and fervently than the others. This sentiment of unity led England to come to an agreement with the United States in 1923 regarding the payment of her war debts, thus voluntarily burdening her citizens with an unprecedented weight of taxation." Dr. Kohn apparently fails to observe that war-exhausted debtors—like the proverbial beggars—can hardly be choosers.

This superficial idealism spoils the book in several places. For example, in dealing with Russia, the author remarks: "England was the birthplace of middle-class revolution. Russia has been the first to achieve social revolution" (page 125). What does he mean? Was not the middle-class revolution a social one? Is the Russian revolution anything but a middle-class one, in spite of the activity of the workers therein? Indeed, Dr. Kohn seems far too ready to accept Bolshevik claims at their face-value, and is prepared to make excuses of this character.

"Though Russian policy in Asia after 1917 was often determined by national egotism and conducted from the point of view of Russia's well-being and expansion, yet this was done in the name of an international ideal which augmented its force and, at the same time, gave it a sanction comparable only with England's middle-class European ideal of gradual training in the blessings of freedom and self-government" (pp. 130-1).

"A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," and we do not like Russian capitalist nationalism and imperialism any the better because it is labelled "Communism." Dr. Kohn is on firmer ground when he points out that "there were similarities between Russia's social structure and that of the East. . . . Like Russia, the East was predominantly agricultural. As in Russia, the most urgent task was to solve the problem of the peasants and the land (page 143).

There you have the matter in a nutshell. Neither Russia nor the Orient provide the conditions necessary for the establishment of Socialism (i.e., social ownership of the means of production), and Communists who argue that ideas can be transplanted regardless of that fact are trying to stand the historical process upon its head. Unfortunately, once more Dr. Kohn fails to look at the matter in the light of his own observations, and appears to look at the peasant millions of Russia and the East for considerable assistance in the elucidation of Europe's problems; "Europe's," that is, in the same sense that they have originated there and do not change their essential character when they spread eastward.

We look in vain for evidence in support of this view. It is true that (as in Europe in the sixteenth century) religion in the East is losing authority and its place is being taken by nationalist politics; but Dr. Kohn provides ample evidence in the course of his book that this movement touches but the fringe of the population. Everywhere it is the "intellectual minority," an insignificant fraction, that is struggling for power; the passive fatalistic peasant mass may here and there be stirred into activity in support of this minority. Temporarily, the peasants may score victories and some increase their holdings; whereupon they become as reactionary as any feudalist.

In the long run, however, capitalism expropriates the peasants as ruthlessly as it does the handicraftsmen before them. The tax-collector and the money-lender denude him more or less rapidly of his property and thus convert him into raw material for the labour market.

For this expropriated class of producers neither nationalism nor Dr. Kohn's "fellowship of common destiny" (much less his "world-consciousness") has anything intelligible to offer. They are but pawns in the game of life so long as that game is played by rival sections of the master class. Their historic mission is the "expropriation of the expropriators," and on this point Dr. Kohn is most disappointingly foggy.

E. B.

WANTED: A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*.

Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months.

A DEBATE.

A debate took place on Friday, March 28th, at the A.E.U. Institute, Sheffield, between J. T. Murphy, representing the Communist Party of Great Britain, and our representative, E. Boden, of the Sheffield Branch.

OUR CASE.

The subject of the debate was: "Which Party should the workers support—the S.P.G.B., or the C.P.G.B.?"

Comrade Boden, who opened the debate, outlined the subject position of the working class in capitalist society, and showed that this subject condition could only be abolished by converting the means of living from being the private property of the capitalist class into the common property of society. This conversion could be carried out only after the capture of the political machinery by the workers, organised in the Socialist Party. Comrade Boden laid stress on the fact that the state control of capital (as in Russia) and the administration of capitalism by so-called "Labour" representatives (as in Great Britain) are not Socialism.

THE CASE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

In his reply, Mr. Murphy described this as the "most hopeless message he had ever listened to."

He said that our representative had outlined some very simple facts concerning the class division in society which he did not dispute, but had not told the workers what they were to do to-morrow morning. The Soviet Union was the one exception to the general statement that the capitalists owned the means of living. The S.P.G.B. maintained a counter revolutionary attitude towards the Soviet Union. (Mr. Murphy did not venture to offer any evidence for this statement but merely contented himself with making it.) Definitions of capital were of minor importance. The burning question was how to establish Socialism!

The S.P.G.B. had a wonderful philosophy. They regarded the workers as a lot of fools who were no further advanced than they were ten years ago.

The Communist Party held that Marxists must be in the struggle consciously; but the S.P.G.B. stood society on its head. They told the workers not to strike or organise in the factories, but to be quiet. The Communist Party regarded strikes and unemployed marches as part of the political

struggle leading up to the smashing of the State machine. Parliament was a capitalist machine, which could not be used by the workers; but the S.P.G.B., like the I.L.P., held that the workers could get Socialism by simply voting for it.

SECOND SPEECH FOR THE S.P.G.B.

In his second speech, Comrade Boden pointed out that Mr. Murphy had made a series of false statements. The S.P.G.B. did not tell the workers not to strike, and to be quiet. What they did say was that strikes failed either to remove the cause of poverty or to change the general direction of capitalist development. Hence the necessity for political action. Mr. Murphy's statements regarding Russia were not in accordance with the facts. Lenin's "Preparing for Revolt" was quoted as evidence that the Bolsheviks had no intention of dispossessing the capitalists as a class, and further quotations from the Soviet Union Year Book, 1929, were read to show that capitalist property in the form of State loans was rapidly developing in Russia. Comrade Boden pointed out that the workers there were exploited by means of the wages system as in other countries.

COMMUNIST REPLY.

Mr. Murphy, in his reply, stated that the attempt by revolutionary workers in Italy to capture Parliament was met by Fascism. The workers would have to crush the capitalists on the streets. The Russian Revolution had shown the way in which the workers should come to power. The S.P.G.B. said there had been no Revolution in Russia, but the workers owned the means of living there. True, they did not receive the full fruits of their labour individually, but they did so collectively through their control of the State. They talked of their "wages," but that was only a convenient expression for the benefit of people with only average intelligence. Really, another word should be used to describe the arrangement. The workers ruled in Russia, but the S.P.G.B. talked the language of counter-revolution. Mr. Murphy said that the S.P.G.B.'s case had vanished and in its place stood a diatribe against Russia. The S.P.G.B. took its stand alongside the Archbishop of Canterbury. Our speaker had accused the Communists of supporting the Labour Party, but Mr. Murphy asserted that this was only because its leaders were at the head of the Trade Union movement in

the General Council during the General Strike. True, they were only there to betray it, but what were the Communists to do—become strike-breakers?

FINAL SPEECH FOR THE S.P.G.B.

In his concluding speech, Comrade Boden said that Mr. Murphy seemed unable to distinguish between taking part in a strike against the employers, and supporting the Labour Party (a party admitted by the Communists to be a capitalist party) during an election.

To a Socialist the difference between a strike and a demand for reforms of the capitalist system is obvious.

Mr. Murphy's statement that in Russia the workers are the rulers is not in accordance with the facts. The assistant secretary of the Russian Communist Party, V. Molotov, in his book, "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union," states that less than half of the Party members are workers, and they constitute a small minority of the working class of Russia. Further, the reactionary elements who were supposed to have been suppressed 10 years ago are active inside the Russian Communist Party, as is shown by the repeated "purgings." This fact alone disposed of the claims made on behalf of the dictatorship in Russia.

Finally, the three principal pillars of the State which the Bolsheviks were alleged to have smashed (*i.e.*, the political police, the bureaucracy and the standing army) remain intact according to Molotov. They would do so while capitalism lasted in Russia.


MR. MURPHY WINDS UP THE DEBATE.

In winding up the debate, Mr. Murphy asserted that the army in Russia is "ours." It was only natural that reactionary elements should force their way into the ruling party in any country. It had happened in Ireland, but in Russia these elements were being discovered and expelled.

"Socialism and Religion."

This unique Party Pamphlet is now reprinted at a price within the reach of all.

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

 Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.

TO NEW READERS.

Our object is the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by, and in the interests of, the whole people. Let us examine this object a little closer.

First of all, what do we mean by common ownership? Do we propose taking over all the means of production, etc., and then dividing them up amongst the whole people? Of course not. Mills and factories, railways and steamships, are all too large and too complicated to admit of piecemeal division. In fact, one of the benefits capitalist production has conferred upon society is just this: that it has organised production on a large scale, though the process has brought misery to millions of workers and small proprietors. If we were to attempt to "divide up" existing wealth, therefore, we would have to take a step backward in development and revert to the primitive productive methods of our forefathers. And even if it were possible to take such a step backward, we would then be faced with two hopeless tasks: (1) To produce enough to satisfy the needs of the present huge population, without the productive, transport and other facilities that exist to-day; and (2) with private property of a primitive kind in existence to prevent the regrowth of huge amalgamations, such as exist to-day.

So for the above reasons, and a host of others, we do not propose a "dividing-up" policy. What we do intend is that all the means of producing and distributing the things we need shall be taken over and administered as the common possession of one huge family—the human family. In other words, that each will be free to eat, drink and clothe himself according to his needs, and that in return each will contribute his services to production according to his capacities and the requirements of the times. This will involve the organisation of production according to plan. That is, it will be necessary to determine roughly: (1) The production required; (2) the raw material and machinery, etc., required; (3) the amount of work required to ensure the necessary production; (4) the allocation of the population to the work required.

Now the early stages of this alteration will obviously not be easy; it will involve an internal readjustment that will be great or small according to the size and mental clear-

ness of the majority in favour of Socialism. Once a real beginning has been made, however, the tremendous surplus of working energy society possesses will soon make itself plain, and the call upon each individual for necessary productive work will be small. As we have often pointed out in these columns, one has only to pause for a moment and reflect upon the appalling waste of labour to-day involved in useless competition, in advertising, in Army, Navy, Police and Air Forces, in pandering to the tastes of a luxurious, bored and debauched ruling class, and finally—apart from myriads of other ways—in the tragic comedy of hundreds of thousands looking for work, while hundreds of thousands are in want.

When the new society has settled down to production on the new plan of organisation there will be ample leisure for each individual to employ himself in ways productive of pleasure. To some leisure time devoted to invention; to others the devotion to the different arts will be the outlet for their superfluous energies. Others again will like to spend some time in travel, and it is just here that the new arrangement promises most. Modern industry has so simplified production that it has reduced the part of each to a comparatively simple one, and the tendency in this direction is still rapidly proceeding. Hence, under Socialism, as long as there is sufficient man (or woman) power in a given centre, it will not matter how often or how rapidly people change from one place to another. In the early days of capitalism it was customary for the handicraftsman to spend a part of his training in travelling from town to town, gaining experience before settling down, hence the name "journeyman." In like manner, in the future, a worker will be able to cover the whole globe, working here and there, and dull, drab routine work will disappear.

This is not an idle dream. Ponder upon it, and you will find it is possible, inevitable and the glorious legacy of ages of suffering. GILMAC.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

PORTRAIT OF THE LABOUR PARTY.

By EGON WERTHEIMER.

(G. P. Putnam. 5s. 214 pages.)

This book is written by a German journalist who resided in London for six years as correspondent for two German Social Democratic newspapers.

The impressions received and the opinions formed of the Labour Party by the author are alternately flattering, candid, and refreshingly simple.

His facts are clouded by romanticism. The leadership of the Labour Party by MacDonald and Snowden is accounted as a great "moral victory for the I.L.P."; Clynes and Henderson are "products which the British Labour Party can justly regard with pride." Cook is described as a "weak man, intellectually far below the average miner's agent, fascinated with the half-baked Marxism he picked up at Labour College classes, and mixing the Communist dialect with that of the Nonconformist evangelical preacher . . ." And George Lansbury—"the old class warrior and most endearing figure among all the English left and by whose side a man like Cook cuts a pitiful figure."

The Labour Party is compared with corresponding organisations in Germany and on the Continent generally. The policies of these organisations are said to be based on Marxian knowledge, in which the members are said to be well grounded. The result being that the German organisations make "less mistakes" than their British brethren. Of what does this alleged scientific Marxian knowledge and outlook of the Continental parties consist? Were they not, in common with the British Labour Party members of the same non-Socialist international which collapsed so pitifully on the outbreak of War in 1914? Did they not support the sectional Capitalist interests of their National Governments, and form Coalitions with the enemies of the working class? In spite of the alleged "Socialism" of the German parties, Mr. Wertheimer says that their Marxism is mere "lip-service," and that the British Labour Party and the German Social Democrats are in "immeasurably closer relationship than in the first half decade in the twentieth century." We contend that if there has

ever been any difference between the British Labour Party and its equivalents on the Continent, it has never been due to one of them pursuing a policy based upon working class interests, arising from sound Socialist knowledge, in opposition to all Capitalist parties and interests.

Mr. Wertheimer says erroneously that the I.L.P. is a "Socialist organisation of an extreme kind," that adopted an attitude of "absolute condemnation to the War." This is consistent with the author's "ideas of Socialism," and "Sound Marxian training and knowledge." He describes an organisation which permitted its members to support the War on grounds of "individual conscience"—as the I.L.P. did—as being in "absolute condemnation to the War." The facts are that the I.L.P. decided on a policy, and permitted its members, as "individuals," to oppose that policy. Such two-faced conduct enabled them to trim their sails to any wind that blew. A game of which they and their colleagues of the Labour Party are masters.

The Communist Party, we are told, was a "child of crisis." It was formed from the ashes of the Shop Steward movement and the cinders of such obscure organisations as the "Socialist Labour Party" and the "Socialist Party of Great Britain." This is really unkind! Our bitterest enemies in their wildest moments have never held us responsible, or partly responsible, for the Communist Party. Neither have we been reduced at any time to that relative condition which could be compared to cinders. That "child of crisis," the Communist Party, was a creature of circumstance, and working class lack of knowledge. The Socialist Party, which seeks to provide that knowledge of Socialism, certainly did not have any hand whatever in forming or assisting the Communist Party.

The book is moderately priced and makes interesting and easy reading for those who would like to learn what are a foreigner's impressions of English political life.

H. W.

 **HAVE YOU READ**
—this Pamphlet—
"SOCIALISM."

43 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

TOLSTOY ON WORK.

I was always astonished at the accepted opinion (current especially in Europe) that work is a kind of virtue. I always felt that it was only excusable in an irrational animal, such as the ant in the fable, to elevate work to the rank of a virtue and to make a boast of it. M. Zola assures us that work makes men kind; the contrary has always been true in my experience. Without considering selfish work, which is always bad, the object of which is the well-being or aggrandisement of the worker, even "work for its own sake," the pride of the worker, renders both ants and men cruel. Which of us does not know these men, untouched by considerations of truth and kindness, who are always so busy that they not only never have time to do good, but cannot even ask themselves whether their work is not harmful? You say to these people: "Your work is useless, perhaps even pernicious, for the following reasons; pause and consider them for a moment."

They will not listen to you, but scornfully reply: "You men have leisure to reason about such matters, but what time have I for discussions? I have worked all my life and work does not wait; I have to edit a daily paper with a circulation of half-a-million; I have the army to organise, the Eiffel Tower to build, Chicago Exhibition to arrange, to cut through the Isthmus of Panama, to make investigations on the subject of heredity, telepathy, or to find out the number of times such and such a word occurs in the works of such and such a classic author."

The most cruel of men, the Nero's and the Peter the Great's, have been constantly active, never pausing or giving themselves a moment free from occupation or distraction. Even if work is not a vice it can from no point of view be looked upon as a merit. Work can no more be considered a virtue than can nutrition; work is a necessity of which one cannot be deprived without suffering, and to elevate it to the rank of a merit is as monstrous as it would be to do the like for nutrition. The only explanation of this strange value attributed to work in our society is that our ancestors regarded laziness as an attribute of nobility, almost of merit, and that people in our time are still influenced by the reaction from that prejudice.

In my opinion, not only is work not a

virtue, but in our defectively organised society it is more often a means of moral anaesthesia, just as are tobacco, wine and other means of drowning thought and hiding from ourselves the disorder and emptiness of our lives.

CHOOSE YOUR JOB—AND GET RICH.

Lord Cowdray (better known as Sir Weetman Pearson), the Liberal engineering and oil millionaire, built up a fortune out of the shares in firms and combines, he "controlled." When he died recently he left behind advice to parents and children which the *Daily Express* (February 20th) entitles, "How to Become a Millionaire." Among the hints are the following:

Be sure that the career you are embarking upon is going to be congenial to you, that you have an aptitude for it, and that you can put your whole heart and energy into it. Your business in life should also become your great pleasure.

Work hard and be patient. Do your best each and every day.

Like most employers who become multi-millionaires, Lord Cowdray made it harder for the worker to become an employer because he increased the size of his business so largely that competition became more difficult. He did not leave any information telling the workers how they could choose congenial occupation in these days when Labour Exchanges say "take any job you can get." "Work hard," says the industrial Lord, but most of the workers who have slaved their whole lifetime are without any wealth. The Editor of the *Sunday Express* (Mr. James Douglas) admits that hard work under this system is ruinous to the workers. His words are:

"Our working people live their whole life on the poverty line, some of them a little below it and some of them a little above it, but most of them precariously poised on it."

K.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Sunday | Head Office, 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1
8 p.m.
Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 4 p.m.
Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m.
Magdalene Road, Tooting, 11.30 a.m. |
| Tuesday | Bricklayers' Arms, 7.30 p.m. |
| Wednesday | Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. |
| Saturday | Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m. |

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., 2, Hanbury-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 82, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney k.d. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, How Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 99, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON. Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets Thursdays 8 p.m. at 44, Edgedale Road. Communications to Sec., at above address.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 310. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1930.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHY THE COMMUNISTS HAVE FAILED. PARROT DISEASE.

A malady stalks through Britain—ruthless self-criticism! The serried ranks of the Communist Party have been decimated. From the humblest local official to the most renowned national protagonist, none are safe from its insidious attack. All the tried and trusty slogans, such as "Work or Wages," "Fight like Hell," and "Hands off China," threaten to vanish into obscurity before the parrot-like repetition of this sinister phrase.

Even ten years ago it seemed inevitable that something dreadful would happen to the British recipients of Russian money; and here, at long last, it has. The Slavonic vice of introspection has followed in the wake of the rouble, and displaced the good old Teutonic virtue of which they used to boast—Solidarity!

Ten years ago when carping critics—such as are to be found in the S.P.G.B.—tried to point out to the romantic worshippers of Lenin the obstacles and dangers in the way of any attempt to adopt his policy in this country, they were waived aside as beneath contempt. Was not the German revolution already in progress and would not Britain inevitably follow suit? But now!

Dangers to Right of them, dangers to Left of them, dangers all round them, dangers inside them! Such is the state of affairs revealed by "ruthless self-criticism." Pick up almost any copy of the *Daily Worker* and then ask yourself how any member of the Politbureau manages to get a night's sleep. Take this, for example, from the issue of May 3rd: "Since the 10th Plenum, particularly, the Party leadership has made the grave error of not conducting a relentless struggle against the right elements in the Party who—and this is significant—have been strongest in the

mining areas, particularly in South Wales." In other words, even some of their own members evidently realise the absurdity of telling the workers to "Fight like hell" on empty bellies.

Further, "The Party's mistake in supporting Cook has materially contributed to the unsatisfactory state of the mining campaign. Cook's whole line, which had the full support of the Party, was to work within the apparatus of the M.F.G.B.; to work wholly from within the narrow circle of the trade union bureaucracy, while he deceived the Party with the illusion that he was preparing for an open break with the bureaucracy."

"He headed the fight at a certain period only to betray it more effectively." We of the S.P.G.B. never credited Cook with so much brains as to be able to think that out, nor have we come across evidence that he was ever more than a weak, emotional "hero" who found the forces of capitalism too strong for him. We did, however, point out at the time the childish futility of his nationalisation - cum - rationalisation campaign (supported by the Communist party), and the sheer folly of trusting the miners' case to the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

The Communist Party, however, self-styled "leaders of the masses in the daily struggle" discovers its error four years after the event and straightway puts on sackcloth and ashes. That is "the new line"! A veritable clothes-line upon which the Party's dirty linen is to be publicly hung out to dry. Well may they tell us now that "the Leadership that the Party achieved in the 1926 struggle has been dissipated through lack of understanding of the objective character of the coal situation," and

that in the principal industrial areas "the May Day demonstrations cannot be described as other than a complete failure." (*Daily Worker*, May 17th.)

Mr. J. T. Murphy (see issue of May 19th) has discovered the "necessity of study"!

This, from one of those who told us ten years ago that the time for propaganda even, let alone study, had gone by, and that "now is the time for action"! "Theoretical study," he says, "is an essential part of practical work, and those who try to set them one against the other have not yet learnt the first lesson of Bolshevism."

Evidently, the state of the Communist Party in this respect leaves much to be desired, for he proceeds: "It is too often assumed the changing of the Executive of the party settled the question of the Right danger. No greater mistake could be made than to encourage this idea. That was only a beginning . . . the transformation of the whole Party into a real Bolshevik Party is a much bigger job, involving not only a complete change in methods of work, but a deep and thorough understanding by the Party of the reasons for the changes and the methods that have to be employed." In short, after telling us for ten years that all we had to do was to fall in and follow them, they confess to not having been a "real Bolshevik Party" at all, and have just awakened to the necessity of having something firm upon which to place their intellectual feet.

Twenty-six years ago the founders of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, drawn from the obscure rank and file of the working class (bricklayers, compositors, cabinet-makers, day labourers and out-of-works) with never an "intellectual," so-called, among them, framed a set of principles. These had been derived from the scientific examination of working class experience. They have always been open for inspection and outside critics have been freely challenged to do their worst. They form the basis of the party's existence.

We do not claim to be infallible. There are mistakes that any Socialist may make, being but human; but there are mistakes which no Socialist does make because he understands the position of the working class. Under this latter heading we place the "mistakes" of the Communist Party. Nothing but blindness to the plain lessons of the workers' history and the everyday

facts of the workers' lives can account for them. No eloquent orators nor brilliant dictators can replace the need for learning those lessons and facing those facts—and the leaders of the C.P. in this country are anything but brilliant.

Having stifled criticism where possible—as in Russia—and ignored it elsewhere, the would-be dictators have gone from blunder to blunder, piling up disappointments upon one another for their easy followers, until at length even they feel the need for some explanation for the never-ending series of defeats. Democratic criticism is as incompatible with dictatorship as oil is with water. Hence the dictators must criticise themselves! Their followers can be trusted to swallow the dope.

Dictatorships are supposed by their admirers to secure unity; but the superficial unity secured by suppression, as practised by the C.P., merely cloaks the ceaseless passing of the dictators from left to right in the endeavour to preserve the balance of their power.

Instead of a consistent policy arising logically from a set of principles intelligible to all the members of the Party, the dictators have as many policies or "lines" as there are days in the week and use them to play off their supporters against each other. Divided, either by material interests or sheer ignorance, these latter are an easy prey. Each change of policy appears either to one section or another to be the long-looked-for resurrection of the Party, the evidence of new-life. By the time this section has spent its force and enthusiasm it is time for another change. And so the game goes on.

In economically backward countries—such as Russia—where the peasantry form such a large proportion of the population, this political fluctuation has some kind of meaning; it is rooted in, and, therefore, explained by the conditions. In this country, where the overwhelming mass of the population are wage-slaves with a common interest in abolishing capitalism, would-be dictators are merely ridiculous.

The remedy in Russia is economic development which proceeds, now with the assistance of the Bolsheviks, and now in spite of them. In Britain the remedy lies in Socialist education. The economic conditions are ripe for Socialism. What the workers lack is knowledge of the fact!

E. B.

PULL UP THE BLINDS.

The present system of producing wealth we define as the Capitalist system, and we do so because the button that sets all the machinery in motion is the investment of capital. Whenever a fresh company is about to commence operations a prospectus is issued asking for capital, and describing in glowing colours how profitable such an investment will be. It is true, as the recent columns of the papers show, many companies come to grief, but this is due to many things outside of the scope of the present article.

A society lives by the production of wealth of one kind or another, and as we look back through history we find that there have been certain definite and different forms of wealth production and that each form has brought into existence certain relationships between the people who have made up each Society.

At one time the bulk of the goods were produced by what were called chattel slaves, for example, in Ancient Rome. There was a privileged class who owned the land and tools and this class bought labourers to work for them in return for food, clothing and shelter. The chattel slave then was like a horse or other domestic animal.

In later times the bulk of the goods of society were produced by serfs or bond slaves. That is, people bound by custom, and paying tribute to a privileged class in the form of a certain number of days' free labour each week—work for nothing.

But the growth of trading altered both these forms. In each of the above instances the goods produced were consumed mainly at home or in the local area. Only a tiny fraction of what was produced was sold and trade was looked upon with disfavour. But trading grew until it ultimately became, as it is to-day, practically the sole object of production. This has made a tremendous difference in the relationships of the groups within Society. The slave owner of old occupied a paternal position towards his slaves. The relationship was a personal one. The Feudal Lord likewise had a personal connection with his serfs and discharged certain duties in the local courts. In each of these cases privilege was based upon the ownership of land. It was territorial.

The coming of universal trading with capital as its main-spring destroyed the

earlier systems based upon land with personal relations between employer and employed, and substituted a new system based upon the ownership of capital. The ownership of capital carries with it the ownership of the means of production, although the capitalist finally becomes merely the holder of titles to profits. The relation of the capitalists to their employees ceased to be personal long ago. In consequence the capitalist can go to Africa or the North Pole, but his capital still brings in dividends and he still remains the controller of his employees. This fact produces, at times, some curious situations. An instance of one was given in the columns of this periodical last month, where it was shown that money left to a woman who was insane still piled up dividends for her.

Wealth, in the economic sense, is food, clothes, houses, ships, and so on. This wealth is produced by the application of human energy, in one form or another, to material supplied by nature. For instance, for the building of a wooden hut trees are felled by workmen, transported by workmen, sawn up by workmen, and erected into a hut by workmen. In order that these workmen may fell, saw, transport and erect, other workmen must produce food, clothing, and so forth, so that the hut workers may live while doing their work. That is because to-day there is a division of labour and workers specialize in different industries. Under Feudalism this degree of specialization did not exist, for huts were made from the trees grown on the manor and the serfs on the manor produced enough food and other things to keep themselves while doing the hut-building. Now industries have grown up calling for specialization, and something else has occurred as well.

Under feudalism the worker used small tools, hand tools, which he owned himself, and in the case of the handicraftsman carried with him when he changed his place of living. When trading and the use of capital became general the small tool disappeared with the handworker, and the great factory and machine tool, served by machine minders, took his place. With the coming of the machine, goods were produced rapidly and in large quantities. The natural resources near at hand were not sufficient to feed the mouth of the huge machine, and the market close at hand was not sufficient to consume what was turned out. So there

began to occur periods of time between the beginning and the end of the productive process and during this period the workers who had become specialists had to live. So it became necessary to provide ever larger and larger quantities of wealth to keep the workers while they worked and it was here that capital came in and, as it were, caught the worker by the throat, for the worker is without capital and depends upon wages to keep him from week to week.

Now let us see what was the source from which this capital flowed.

If we examine the present and the past we are struck by the fact that a number of people, the privileged or ruling class in each system, have been able to live without working. The conclusion is, therefore, forced upon us that at each period those who were engaged in production must have produced far more than would keep themselves, otherwise there would not have been enough to keep the idlers.

Now feudalism with its system of customary payments makes this as clear as daylight for the serf worked 3 or 4 days for himself—that is on his own plot of land raising enough for his keep—and gave three days' work to the lord's land to keep the lord and his retainers. The feudal worker was, therefore, exploited and robbed of nearly half of the product of his energies and he realized this fact so well that he used to dawdle and take things easy when working on the lord's land. In fact this became such a crying evil, from the lords' point of view, that it had a great influence upon the movement for substituting money payments for payments by service.

Now the worker is also exploited to-day, but his exploitation is cloaked by the complexity of the present system. Whereas in the past the payment of service to the employer was made directly and openly, now it is hidden by the system of paying wages.

Trading is the buying and selling of goods and originally was accomplished by means of barter—that is by exchanging one kind of goods directly for another. As the business of exchanging grew, it became necessary to have a certain fixed medium of exchange, whose value would be recognised by everyone and at the most distant trading points. Custom and its handiness finally made gold the universally recognised medium or money. Later still titles to quantities of gold, if sound enough, became as good as gold in normal times, and so the

habit grew of accumulating a store of money to buy goods. These goods were then sold for a greater amount of money than they cost. The trader pocketed the difference and used his original store of money over and over again.

This money that was used is capital. From the purely trading side, capital gradually intruded into the productive side until we have to-day capital as the starting-point for every productive and trading enterprise—in fact, the whole process of production and distribution, in a multitude of cases, is accomplished by the one business organisation. Big trusts, like the Oil Trust, control the product from its origin as a natural product to its delivery as a finished article to the consumer.

In all the processes connected with production money enters as a paying medium, and except in the profit accounts of the companies there is nothing to show where the exploitation of the worker comes in. For while it is said that money talks, it gives no secrets away.

Consequently, when the capitalist pays wages for work done the matter is supposed to have ended and the worker is supposed to have received full value for his work. But what in fact has the worker received? What does his wage represent? A glance at the condition of workers in general will give the answer. The worker receives in wages, on the average, only what is necessary to keep him fit to continue his occupation and bring up a family to replace him. Sometimes he does not even receive that, and has to resort to charitable and other sources.

But what has the worker produced during the time he has been working? The capitalist will say that the worker is but a cog in the machinery and has only taken part in the work of a fractional portion of production. Very well then! What does the working class as a whole produce? The total wealth of society. And what does the working class receive back? Only a fraction of what they have produced. The rest goes to provide means for the riotous living of the privileged class. It goes to help fine ladies to ride in Rotten Row—to play tennis on the Riviera, to go yachting in the Tropics. It goes to provide fine ladies and gentlemen with the army of servants to answer their beck and call.

The workers produce wealth in such quantities to-day that it chokes society, and

means have to be devised to limit production; and this because the worker's wage limits what he can buy back, and this wage is so far below the value of what has been produced that the capitalists, in spite of their wasteful methods of living, cannot consume the whole of the surplus. The capitalists, therefore, live out of the surplus value extracted from the exploited worker. The sooner the workers pull up the blinds and see this fact in the clear daylight the sooner will they make away with wage slavery, and the oppression to which it gives rise.

GILMAC.

A KNIGHT OUT.

I must admit I find the wireless lectures very stimulating. The lecturer has prepared his subject, there are no interruptions, no interjections, no bronchial whoopings, no scuffling feet, no late-comers or early-goers; in short, there is perfection—nearly. I say nearly, because one feels sometimes that the speaker has prepared his paper in some far-distant country, a good many years ago, and has just walked off the steamer into the studio. Unsuspectingly, he says his little piece, and favoured by the absence of a visible audience, delivers himself of some "truth" that had better remained in its coffin. Now perfection would provide for the lecturer being reminded that his data were slightly mildewed; that possibly in picking up his notes for the lecture on "The Sex Life of Slugs," he had inadvertently added a leaf from the lecture on "Stamp Collecting in the Stone Age."

Something of this sort must have happened to Sir James Jeans, for in his "Point of View," broadcast on February 24th, he made an astonishing mix-up. It is only charitable to assume some such accident, for no scientist since 1880 would have included such matter in a serious lecture. At a birthday party perhaps, or a Fleet Street "smoker," but not in any place where the bracing wind of science can reach.

"Quite frankly," he commenced, "my point of view is that of a scientist—an astronomer." He will not need me to remind him that a scientist frames and tests theories based on verifiable data.

We may take it that when Sir James Jeans says, "We believe that the earth is merely a tiny fragment of the sun, which got splashed off, almost by accident, something

like 2,000 million years ago," he could produce some sort of evidence. When he tells the listening world that the earth is millions of years old; that it remained uninhabited for millions of years; that life arrived and passed through the forms of protozoa, fishes, reptiles, and mammals culminating in man, we may assume he is dealing in facts; that volumes of ordered knowledge bolster up his statements, and that scores of eminent colleagues agree with him. And yet, would you believe a scientist would commit himself, before an audience of millions, to the following fragment of ordered knowledge.

Our socialist orators tell us much in glowing terms about the hypothetical socialist future. Why do they tell us so little about the socialist and communist experiments of the past, in which their theories were really tested? It is, I think, because those experiments all ended in failure. The truth seems to be that no socialist state ever endures for long—as such.

That, of course, is where his manuscript must have got mixed up with the lining of his lunch bag, and he found himself reading a pre-war page from the *Swamp Herald* or *Daily Express*. Unfortunately his attention has not been drawn to the happening, and the statement has received the publicity of print in the *Listener* of March 5th. However, as there may be some few people who think he really meant what he said, I am prepared to make a public confession. I also have wondered in the past why our Socialist orators have told us so little about the Socialist and Communist experiments in which their theories have been tested. I candidly admit my heart gave a great bound, when I heard him raise this question. I thought I was going to satisfy the hope of a lifetime, and hear the names of the Socialist states referred to. Sir James was strangely reluctant to mention them. He himself deplores the reluctance of our Socialist orators to do likewise. I am keenly disappointed, and it looks as though the truth is where I have long suspected. Failing some scientific evidence from Sir James Jeans, I shall be compelled to affirm that he does not know of such a state; that there never was such a state and that Socialist theories have never been tested "really" or in any way. Both his reluctance, and that of our Socialist orators are founded in the same fog-bank. There never was such a Socialist state. The noble knight must have mixed his notes.

The fact of the statement having also been printed rather complicates matters, and perhaps some little explanation may put

things right. The ground has been covered many, many times in this journal, and there is not room in this article to cover it again. But this may be said. As a scientist Sir James Jeans will have heard of evolution. It is the name we apply to the process of development by which life, the earth, and the universe, have changed from simple beginnings to their present state. Nothing is stationary; nothing stagnant—all is ceaseless change. The very Alps were once liquid mud; the mighty oceans were thin gases; the whole earth a boiling globe, incapable of any form of life as we know it. Scientists have described for us the whole wonderful pageant of change, which through millions of centuries, slowly paved the way for the coming of man; and man is fond of regarding himself as the crown of evolution. Anyway, crown or not, he appeared very late upon the scene and has still a lot of development before him. Like everything in the universe, he has evolved. Although he likes to regard himself as something distinct from what he calls Nature, his links with animal ancestors are beyond dispute. Every baby, born into the world, recapitulates in embryo stages of his journey.

Apparently man has always been a gregarious animal, that is, he liked living in company. Other forms of life do, too, baboons, elephants, whales, birds, etc. This custom has clung to man, ever since he was man. And no matter how his mode of life has changed—hunter, pastoralist, or civilised—he has ever been found in communities. These communities have in turn been the subject of change—in a word, have evolved, and scientists can tell us why one form of human society gave place to another, and how our own form stands at the end of a chain. This will suggest, of course, to the intelligent reader, that there is no reason why this should be the end of the chain. But before we consider that, there is one important point to make. Evolution is only a name we apply for convenience sake to a process. It is not like the word God, which we spell with a capital letter, and use as a convenient cover for all we do not know. Evolution is simply a word for the process of development. It does not imply purpose, or intention. For instance, the *Mauretania* has evolved from the dug-out canoe, but the prehistoric contrivers of the dug-out had not the remotest conception of the liner. The words you are

reading are connected with the marks on the clay bricks of Babylon, but neither Nebuchadnezzar nor his dusky subjects could have seen the printing press in futurity. The Rolls-Royce has evolved from the ox-cart, the tractor-plough from the digging stick, the sky-scraper from the mud-hut, but none of those at the dawn of things had the fragment of an idea of latter-day developments. It was not until comparatively recently that evolution became a mental concept and that mankind realised its possibilities.

The working of evolution has been blind. In mankind Nature becomes conscious and aware of the forces of development. Man applies the methods of science to his own development and the development of his institution. No longer is he at the mercy of blind forces. He is learning to tame them and use them for his own definite advancement. Wild beasts, famine and pestilence do not play the part they did in human affairs. Every year sees them more under control. The greatest problems man has to face are those arising from his living in huge communities. These communities have arisen in traceable progression, from the collection of mud-huts on the banks of a river to the intricate community of a hundred thousand towns and a hundred million people. But the allied questions of feeding, clothing and sheltering humanity have been treated in a haphazard fashion under civilisations dependent upon trading.

Being fortuitous and haphazard, it has had the unscientific results one would expect. In one section of the community too many clothes, in another too few; one section glutted with food to satiety, another on the brink of starvation or living on inferior food and substitutes; one section with huge houses, well built, well lighted and well furnished; the other with inadequate shelters, poorly built, meagrely lighted and furnished with rubbish. At one place you will find thousands of hungry people, whilst food is being wilfully destroyed at another. You will find thousands of people contracting rheumatism through lack of proper foot covering, whilst makers of boots are unable to make them; because—crowning absurdity—because they have made too many for the market.

The needs of the community are neither ascertained nor met in any really scientific way. One ruling principle dominates society—the making of profit. When every-

body wants something, that is called demand. Numbers of individuals in the hope of making a profit, rush forward with their goods; that is called supply. The rival suppliers try to overreach and ruin each other; they try to monopolise as much of the demand as they can; they waste huge sums in what is called advertising; they drive their workers to produce the greatest possible wealth, in the shortest possible time. Then suddenly it is found that they have produced too much, and those who have made the wealth are rewarded with unemployment and semi-starvation.

There are people who say this method of feeding, clothing and sheltering ourselves, this hapless, planless, mad scramble to make need and supply balance, is the best humanity has discovered. You will usually find such people occupy a fortunate position in society. It would be odd to find them decrying a system which yielded them a very happy life. But there are others who say that now mankind has achieved an understanding of evolution, he can organise his community upon a scientific basis, and one wherein poverty can be unknown. He has no need to leave his present community and proceed to some desolate, primitive country and start building huge machines in the wilderness. Nothing would result from that, but a heap of rust and a few skeletons. No! he is to take the civilization he has built, and reorganize it upon a basis of communal ownership. He is to abolish the out-of-date cumbrous and unscientific custom of individuals or groups owning communal necessities. Without food we starve; without clothing we shiver; without shelter we become diseased and die; and yet there are people who say these human essentials are best provided by those whose sole motive is their own enrichment. Sounds a bit mad, doesn't it! How future schoolchildren will smile, and wonder if it was really true. It will seem so obvious to them that the communal necessities should be communally owned. And to think that we can do it, whenever we like; whenever, that is, the working class organises itself to consciously remould human society on the lines described in our Object. W. T. H.

WANTED: A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*. Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months.

MINDS AND MUDDLE.

It is painfully obvious that workers can only be employed by those who purchase the goods they produce; yet so persistently has the word "employer" been wrongly used, that it is difficult to disabuse people's minds of the muddled idea that workers' wages are paid by those who own the means of production. . . . If everybody realised clearly that there is no such thing as an "employing class," that everyone who uses or consumes any product (that is, every man, woman, and child in the country) is an employer, there would be a perfect revolution of thought on the question of wages, taxation and other vital problems.

So wrote Miss Minnie Pallister in an article entitled "Muddled Minds" in *The New Leader* (9/5/1930).

If there is no such thing as an employing class, what do we mean when we speak of employers and employees? Most people, whether socialists or not, will agree that there is one class in modern society that employs workers and pays them wages. If we are not to use terms inaccurately, by what name must we designate this class?

We distinguish the capitalist system from previous forms of society by the fact that it is made up of a capitalist, or employing class, and a class of wage workers. This division is self-evident, and easily the most important characteristic of this form of society.

The employing class own the means of production. They pay wages. They own the wealth that is produced by the workers. That wealth is in the form of commodities, which must be sold before its owners can realise the value contained in them over and above the wages paid for their production. These are the essential facts of capitalism as revealed to us in our daily efforts to obtain a living. Miss Pallister denies the obvious.

It has been the fashion for years with supporters of capitalism to refer to the savings, and even the tools of working-men, as capital. Now we have it from a member of the I.L.P., that every child sucking milk from a feeding bottle, or kicking out its shoes at play is an employer of labour.

If there is not a separate employing class that pays wages, there is no case for Socialism. Capitalism, with its opposing classes of employers and wage-workers, simply does not exist. F. F.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand House, W.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 8d.

The Socialist Standard,

JUNE,



1930

THE LABOUR PARTY AND SECRET DIPLOMACY.

Most people will remember how fervently the Labour Party protested against Secret Diplomacy immediately after the War. With the cunning of the opportunist politician, its leading spokesmen traced the cause of the war to secret diplomacy, and all the white papers, pink papers and yellow papers were triumphantly flourished as a proof of this contention. Of course, all this was many years ago. Now that the Labour Party has become "The Government," their attitude to this, as to many other questions, has undergone a change.

The *Daily News* for the 16th May reports a "scene" in the House of Commons that occurred the previous day, with Mr. Churchill as the centre.

It appears that Mr. Churchill read a telegram despatched by the Coalition Cabinet to Lord Balfour in 1921, during the Washington Naval Conference. It further appears that no Cabinet document can be read in Parliament without the consent of the King, which implies the consent of the existing Government, which "advises" the King.

When Churchill picked up the paper, "the Prime Minister looked up in surprise, and said in a low voice: 'Are you going to read it?'" Churchill then read it. Ramsay MacDonald then asked Churchill if the paper had been published, to which a reply

in the negative was given. After one or two further questions, Ramsay MacDonald then said: "I happen to know the document. Is this a Cabinet paper, and, if it is, has the right hon. gentleman got the usual leave for the disclosure of Cabinet documents." Fenner Brockway followed by asking the Speaker if it was in order "for one who has been a member of a previous Cabinet to quote from Cabinet documents." Lloyd George followed in a similar strain, and finally he and Ramsay MacDonald had a consultation behind the Speaker's chair.

From this it will be seen that "secret diplomacy" still pursues its old course, and information of it only leaks out when politicians like Churchill don't "play the game" or, in vulgar language, "play the dirty"! Mr. MacDonald communicates Cabinet secrets to Liberal and Tory leaders, but not to the general public.

THE POWER TO PRODUCE.

The recuperative powers of modern industry have been fully vindicated by the remarkable position of France eleven years after the war.

In spite of the enormous waste of wealth and loss of man-power during the four years of war, France, according to recent reports, is now being strangled by prosperity! There are no unemployed worth talking of, and there is a tendency for workers to flock to the easier and better paid occupations, so that, for instance, coal production has seriously slumped in consequence.

A part of France's opulence is due to the amount they have received from Germany; under the Dawes Plan they have had over £200,000,000 during the last five years.

Germany has paid heavily in money, labour, and kind since the war to the "victorious" nations, besides harbouring an army of occupation.

How is it with Germany, then? Is Germany sinking under the burden? Not at all. Germany has shouldered the burden and more. She is again attacking the world's trade routes, both by sea and air, and looks very much like being successful again.

In each case, then, we have an example of the marvellous fecundity of modern industry. When it is also realized how much of the labouring power of to-day is wasted on useless objects, or going over the same ground several times, like milkmen, bakers,

greengrocers, and the like, the fruitfulness of industry is seen to be more remarkable still.

Imagine the numberless workers who waste their time in advertising trades, in menial duties for the rich, in military service, and similar occupations; in useless clerical work and salesmanship. If all these workers, including the unemployed and the rich, were devoted to useful occupations wealth would be more abundant still, and would call for a comparatively small amount of effort from each if the work was spread equally over all.

Here, then, is convincing evidence that the sufferings of the workers are not due to any weakness in the capacity to produce wealth, and also exposes the hollowness of the plea of the nationaliser, except that nationalization produces larger profits.

The workers' attention should, therefore, be directed to securing an alteration in the distribution of wealth. The distribution, of course, depends upon the *method* of production. The method of production to-day is by means and instruments of production that are privately owned. By converting these privately-owned means into social property the workers will then reap the benefit of the energy they put into the production of wealth, and will also reap a good deal of much-needed leisure and freedom from worry.

When the workers decide to secure this fundamental change there will be no need for Labour sponsored cotton weeks, silk weeks, leather weeks, wool weeks, or any of the other Canute-like or cute dodges with which the employing class try to throw dust in the workers' eyes.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 86, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153, Blackfriars Road, S.E.
D. A. McLean, 17 Union Street, Belfast.
W. Pryer, 25 St. Leonards Street, Bromley-by-Bow.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS**WHY NOT JOIN THE LABOUR PARTY?**

The Editor,
THE SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Isleworth, Middx.

May 16th, 1930.

Dear Comrade,

Why this continuous attack upon the Labour Party? The Labour Party has declared its belief in Socialism, and the aim of all Socialist bodies and Socialists is to obtain Socialism in the shortest possible time.

How can this end be attained?

By holding meetings, by talking to our fellow-workers, and by the distribution of literature. Yes, all these methods can be employed and have been employed in the past. But are they sufficient? Is it not perfectly obvious that by these means we can only hope to make a few among the many thousands into competent Marxists, and that even those few must do some hard thinking and hard reading if they really wish to understand. But the majority of them live under conditions which compel them to think about the immediate necessity of getting a living, and therefore are not interested in Socialism as a distant theory.

If, however, we talk to them about things they do understand, such as the houses in which they live and the education which is given to their children, then we have some hope of getting them interested, and if we can hold out the prospect of improving things in the immediate future then we can not only get them interested but we can get them to work hard in order to attain the aims of the party. Having got them into the party and made friends of them, we can now teach them Marxian economics and make real Socialists of them.

There are many competent Marxists within the ranks of the S.P.G.B. Would it not be better policy for them to get inside the ranks of the Labour Party and carry on their educational campaign there?

Come on, comrades, there is plenty of work to do and too few people to do it, and if we are going to get to our objective we must use every means that offers. These people are already prejudiced in favour; hundreds of them are young and intelligent—the very soil on which the seed should be dropped.

Yours fraternally,

A. F. FORREST.

OUR REPLY.

Our correspondent's picture of the Labour Party is purely fanciful. It is seeking to establish not Socialism, a system of society based upon common ownership of the means of production and distribution, but nationalisation, or State Capitalism. The Post Office is its model; an institution which is privately owned by investors in various Government loans, and whose services are not provided freely for use, but sold in order to produce profit, just like other capital concerns.

Our correspondent envisages the Labour Party winning and retaining the "friendliness" of the workers by "improving things" for them. We deny that a Labour Government, elected by non-socialists, is in a position to carry out its promises of improving things. Has our correspondent considered what is going to happen when workers who voted Labour find that the improvement does not materialise? Does he think that the reduction in wages of cotton workers and wool workers, and the half-million men thrown out of work since the Labour Government entered office, are steps on the way to Socialism, and calculated to make the workers more friendly to those responsible?

Our correspondent's arguments are self-contradictory. He first tells us that the Labour Party is committed to Socialism, and then urges us to get inside in order to convert them. Convert them to what? In truth, the overwhelming majority of Labour Party supporters are ignorant of the elements of Socialist knowledge, and to talk of them having declared their belief in something which they do not understand, is merely the evasion of an unpalatable truth.

If we wished to enter the Labour Party (which, of course, we do not) we would most certainly not be permitted to carry on our propaganda for Socialism, for the reason that it would involve, as it does now, pointing out that the programme of reforms of that Party is valueless to the working class.

Our correspondent also assumes that the Labour Party desires to provide its members with Socialist knowledge. We deny this, and ask our correspondent for evidence that the desire, let alone the effort to that end, exists or has ever existed. If it exists, why does not the Labour Party use its press and its platform for that purpose?

ED. COMM.

* * *

THE CAPITALISTS AND REFORMS.

A correspondent suggests that the Capitalists will introduce a large number of reforms in order to dissuade the workers from interesting themselves in Socialism. He asks whether such reforms will, to any degree, make the conditions of the workers better.

If the Capitalists were agreed on the question, there is no reason why the position of the working class should not be

improved at the cost of the Capitalists themselves, but such agreement is not easily achieved. Even in those cases where Capitalist politicians perceive the advisability of a more generous treatment of some of the victims of the system, it is difficult for the Capitalist politicians to convince their backers that need exists, or that "generosity" is the way to deal with discontent. Occasions often arise of the Lloyd Georges, and Baldwins and Churchills of Capitalist politics being forced by their more stupid and ignorant supporters to carry out policies which go against their better judgment and their human sympathies. Future historians will probably be amazed at the appalling meanness (unnecessary, from a Capitalist standpoint), of the treatment meted out to the victims of war and of unemployment, at the present time.

Even when the workers in large numbers go over to the Socialist Party, there will still be influential sections of the Capitalist class (with their working class followers) who will resist reforms, either on the ground that they are "demoralising" to the workers, or that they hamper trade, or that they merely encourage the workers to ask for more. It is, therefore, probable that reforms will always tend to lag somewhat behind the evils which Capitalism goes on producing.

ED. COMM.

* * *

WHAT IS CAPITAL?

An enquirer asks why we talk of abolishing Capital, since, in his view, Capital merely means machinery, tools, etc.

Our correspondent is in error. Capital is wealth used for the purpose of profit. Wealth not used for the purpose of profit is not Capital. When the tools, machinery, buildings, etc., cease to be used for profit, they will not be Capital. The abolition of Capitalism will leave the means of production to be used for the purpose of producing articles for the use of the members of society. There will be no question of private profit, and, therefore, no question of "Capital."

Our correspondent goes on to suggest that "money, or, more truly credit-power," will be needed under Socialism. This is incorrect. Under Socialism, there will be no function for money to perform. Money is a means of trading between

the private owners of goods of various kinds. Where private ownership does not exist, the possibility of exchange, of buying and selling, disappears. The processes which will be necessary under Socialism are the production of useful articles and their distribution to those who need them. Exchange does not enter in, and money is not required. If our correspondent bears in mind that the means of production will be commonly owned, and the products freely distributed, he will see that money can have no function to perform. Looking at it in another way, he will see that money, by its nature, cannot be "commonly owned." To contemplate individuals holding stocks of money under Socialism is to contemplate the possibility of private persons being able to purchase the means of living of other persons—which is, on the face of it, incompatible with our definition of Socialism.

COMMUNISM OR SOCIALISM?

Finally, our correspondent asks if Communism and Socialism are terms which mean the same.

It is not a sufficient answer to trace back the original and interim meanings of the words, because the use of words changes from one generation to another. The chief point is that when we use the word Socialism we define it carefully. (See object on back page.)

Those who use the word Communism, define it differently from our definition of Socialism, or do not define it at all.

In popular usage, the word Communism is associated with the anti-working class policies of the Communist parties. Nothing whatever is to be gained by using two words interchangeably when one will do. Therefore, we do not use the word Socialism to mean the things ordinarily intended by those who use the word Communism.

ED. COMM.

You should read . . .

'THE SOCIALIST'

Organ of the Socialist Educational Society (U.S.A.)

Obtainable from the publishers at 132 East 23rd Street, New York, or from this office.

Price 3½d. per copy, post free; or 3/6 a year post free (one dollar a year post free in the U.S.A.). Bundle rates on application.

POINTS FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

LABOUR CANNOT IMPROVE CAPITALISM.

Mr. Herbert Tracey, the Labour Party's Chief Election Agent, denies the claim made by his own party that conditions can be materially improved in this system. These are his words:—

The workers are not getting a larger share of the national wealth. Under Capitalism the proportionate division of the national product cannot be materially altered; the existing system secretes millionaires and paupers as the liver secretes bile.

(Daily Herald, April 16)

* * *

WHO OWNS GREAT BRITAIN?

The nonsense talked by all defenders of this system, from Tory to Labour, about the wealth of the workers, is completely smashed by the statement of Sir Leo Chiozza Money, the Labour-Liberal statistician. In the *New Leader* of April 11, he states:—

Twenty-five years have elapsed since first, in "Riches and Poverty," I drew attention to the astonishing facts as to the distribution of property revealed by the collection of Death Duties. The facts are not less surprising to-day. In a quarter of a century very little progress has been made in securing a more equitable distribution of land and capital.

The nation, as a going concern, is still, for the most part, owned by a handful of people so small that, if they all left the country, the population would roundly remain unaltered.

And he further says:—

It is equally true that, taking Great Britain as a whole, about 6 per cent. of its families possess nearly 70 per cent. of its land and capital.

* * *

NATIONALISATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

How improved methods of transport affect post office workers in Scotland is shown by the report of the Scottish Council of the Postal Workers' Union:—

It is stated on the authority of official reports that during the last five years 1,700 full-time positions have been cancelled in Scotland as against an increase of 800 part-time positions. The reduction in the number of employees is attributed to the increasing use of motor vehicles in the conveyance of mails, which has made many rural postmen and auxiliary workers unnecessary.

The union are suggesting a reduction in the working week with a view to the avoidance of unemployment in the service.

(Glasgow Evening Times, April 14.)

THE CHEAPNESS OF "LABOUR" REFORMS.

How Labour's reforms save the property-owners money is shown in the following from the I.L.P. paper, *Forward* :—

The change over of the unemployed from parish relief to unemployment benefit, as a result of the Labour Government's new Unemployment Insurance Act, will save Glasgow Ratepayers £400,000 a year, equal to 9d. off the Rates. Seven thousand men who have been receiving parish relief in Glasgow have been transferred to unemployment benefit through the new Act renewing their eligibility. (*Forward*, April 12.)

* * *

THE REVOLUTIONARY I.L.P.!!

Unemployment relief should be a national charge, say both Winston Churchill and the I.L.P.

That was the view of the I.L.P. in 1911 when Lloyd George framed his Unemployment Insurance Act. It is still the view of the I.L.P. The I.L.P. agitators of that time are the Government to-day, and it is left to Winston Churchill, the political adventurer with the adaptable mind, to express the I.L.P. point of view on unemployment relief. (*Forward*, April 12.)

* * *

HUMANIZING SOCIALISM!

I.L.P. OBJECT TO MARX.

Mr. Fenner Brockway, the mouthpiece of the I.L.P., tells us in the *Daily Herald* (Jan. 22) that 20 years ago he read the American Socialist papers every week, and of them he says:

They seemed to aim at making Socialism as difficult and forbidding as possible. The theories of the class struggle, the economic interpretation of history and surplus value were elaborated in detail, and their acceptance in entirety was made the test of Socialist conviction.

I remember discussing this characteristic of American Socialism with Keir Hardie. He told me that before the formation of the I.L.P. British Socialism had been advocated in a similar way. The result was that the working-class was unmoved; it was left cold by the hard materialism, the dogmatic intolerance, and Continental phraseology in which Socialism was expressed.

So Keir Hardie, who ridiculed the class war idea, and got his economics from Jesus, founded the I.L.P., with its sentimental appeal for social reform and a "humanized" capitalism, and support of capitalist parties.

Mr. Fenner Brockway reviews a book called the "Socialism of Our Times," published by the "League of Industrial Democracy" (New York, 50 cents). This is a symposium by various writers who provide advice on "adapting" Socialism to the needs of the U.S.A.

Judging from the quotations, it is a collection of intellectual essays on everything except Socialism.

Mr. Brockway naturally commends the book, and quotes Mr. Harold Laski's suggestions:

The first step must be to awaken the American people to a sense of the positive character of the State. America still regards the State negatively, as we did in this country before the Labour Party entered Parliament. It does not recognise that the State has any responsibility for the unemployed, the sick, the widows, and the aged. Laski urges, therefore, that the first need is to advocate unemployment and health insurance and old age and widows' pensions, plus municipal ownership, taxation for social purposes, and Court and Parliamentary reform. In this way he believes a mental attitude will be created in the public for bigger Socialist reforms.

* * *

PARALYSING SOCIALISM.

So Prof. Laski's suggestion for "Americanizing" Socialism is to demand bigger reforms. What a Socialist Reform is, he doesn't say. Seeing that all reforms are to be passed by the Capitalist Government—obviously they can't be Socialist.

No suggestion is made that the workers should be taught Socialism, so that reforms will not be needed, but Socialism can be established.

The State is to be used by the worker to improve conditions under Capitalism! The State, however, is a machine used under Capitalism to maintain private ownership and to repress the workers. The only use the State will be to a Socialist working-class is to capture it for the purpose of ending this system.

The workers of U.S.A. are advised by Mr. Laski to fight for the social reform legislation Mr. Lloyd George passed under Liberal Party rule.

This late professor of Harvard University understands the problem so little that he advises the workers in the most advanced industrial country to press for the paltry reforms that Germany had under Bismarck, and that England has suffered for many years.

Miss Jessie Wallace Hughan, another contributor to the book, says:

American Socialism was imported by foreign-born doctrinaires. Gene Debs did much to humanise it, but it has still to be Americanised "from the pain economy to the pleasure economy, from the phraseology of the European labourer with nothing to lose but his chains to that of the

American worker with his demands for a Ford and a radio.

American conditions are so different, she would have you believe, that the worker there has something to lose—and demands a radio and a Ford car. But how is it that both this writer and Mr. Laski advocate that the American workers demand all kinds of pensions, "doles," and many other reforms similar to those we have in Europe, where "the labourer has nothing to lose but his chains"? The very reform agitation they favour gives the lie to the alleged differences in the condition of labour between U.S.A. and Europe.

Humanizing Socialism—Mr. Brockway calls his article. It should have been entitled—"Socialism" without Socialists—an I.L.P. beef stew!

* * *

CANADIAN COMMUNISTS.

The Communist Party is as Reformist abroad as it is here. In Toronto Municipal Elections they are running candidates on a programme which covers everything except Communism. Their immediate demands (according to their official organ, *The Worker* (Toronto, Dec. 21)) include:

Unemployed relief of £5 per week to married men and £3 to single men.

An Unemployed Insurance Act.

Seven-hour day and 5-day week and 2 weeks' holiday with pay.

No night work for women and all those under 18 years of age.

2s. 11d. per hour for municipal employees.

Abolition of property qualification for voters.

Town Planning Scheme to pay union rates.

Revision of taxation to benefit the workers.

Free speech assemblage and Press.

That's how they build up Communist support in Canada.

* * *

MORE "DIRECT ACTION"?

"American Socialism or Labor Unions contra Company Unions," by Robert Clausen, 409, East Fifth Street, Los Angeles. Price 35 cents.

This pamphlet, sent to us for review, is evidently the work of an ex S.L.P. member.

The writer claims that the S.L.P. have given up De Leon's main idea, viz., reliance upon the economic organization, "taking and holding" the means of life without affiliation to any political party. Mr. Clausen does not deal with the weakness of De Leon's position. In several articles in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, our Comrade Jacomb showed that the S.L.P. had committed suicide politically by advocating that the work-

ers give their undivided attention to economic organization.

The author of this pamphlet criticises both the "direct action" I.W.W. and also the industrial unions formed by employers for the harmless organization of their workers. These latter are called Company Unions in U.S.A., and their counterpart has grown up here since the General Strike.

Mr. Clausen's pamphlet is a poor presentation of his views, but his chief idea is economic organization of labour, to take the means of production out of the hands of Capital.

He does not show how this can be done. Neither could De Leon or the S.L.P. Mr. Clausen supports Marx's economics, but nowhere did Marx rely upon economic organization. Marx said that the first step was to capture political power (Communist Manifesto). The S.L.P. have not been able to deal with our case against their "direct action" policy, and so they remain silent on this, their special nostrum.

Perhaps Mr. Clausen would like to explain how economic organizations can "come into possession."

* * *

"THE MAKING OF SOCIALISTS."

"Why I doubt that the I.L.P. is a Socialist organization," was the title of a lecture given to the I.L.P. in North St. Pancras on March 6th by E. C. Fairchild.

"He did not think the policy of social reform adopted by the Labour Party had any real connection with Socialism, and thought that the I.L.P. was making the fatal mistake of trying to outbid the Labour Party in reform measures, instead of concentrating on the making of Socialists." (*New Leader*.)

The title of Mr. Fairchild's lecture implies that he isn't sure about the I.L.P. His doubts would not exist if he examined the I.L.P.'s position. It is inside the Labour Party, because that is where the jobs and popularity are. Its members run as Labour Party candidates because that is the way to get elected—and it's election they want, not Socialism. The programme of rationalisation and reform gets millions of votes—advocating Socialism wouldn't. The real crime of the I.L.P. and Labour Party is not merely their reform programme, but the assistance they give to keep power in the hands of the Capitalist Class.

Mr. Fairchild belonged to the Social

Democratic Federation before the War, and in defence of their reform policy, wrote a pamphlet explaining that reforms and palliatives were the weapons of working class struggle.

In a series of articles in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, our Comrade Jacomb analysed the reform nostrums of Mr. Fairchild. Since then the latter left the S.D.F. and joined the I.L.P., who had more reforms in their programme than the S.D.F. And now he is at Ruskin College as a teacher.

Before Mr. Fairchild started his wanderings in the reform wilderness, there was the Socialist Party of Great Britain in existence, and it still exists for the object of making Socialists and establishing Socialism.

* * *

SHAW v. MARX.

"And do not forget that the Marxian dream of a world-wide proletarian revolution, though it is not now practical politics, may yet upset all our conceptions of international relations. The Reformation did not seem practical in the Middle Ages; but it happened for all that."

Thus spoke Bernard Shaw in an interview in the *Sunday Observer* (March 23). It may suit Shaw to portray Marx's idea as a dream, but the Capitalist Class don't spend their time and money fighting dreams. They are busy with every weapon, from mis-education to repression, to try and prevent an end coming to their system. No wonder they are so full of praise for Labour Leaders like Thomas and Labour Politicians like MacDonald, who turn working class discontent into support of Capitalism. Lord Balfour, who has just "gone to heaven," said that Social Reform was the antidote to Socialism. Shaw and the Labour Party support the antidote, while the very development of Capitalism makes Socialism inevitable.

* * *

THE WORKER IN AMERICA.

If the depression continues for another three months the situation will become seriously acute. The American working man has not been accustomed to saving. He has no reserves, and all his luxuries and household goods have been purchased out of income. If he is out of employment, then he will not be able to meet his instalments, and the companies that are keyed up to mass production will find that the percentage of

production necessary to make large profits will be reduced to such an extent that there will not even be small profits—there will be considerable losses.

Thus writes the City Editor of the *Sunday Express* (March 23), on his return from America. This Capitalist paper explodes the myth about the prosperity of the American worker with his "home" and motor car—"bought" on the hire system. The effects of mass production in America should teach the worker here that "greater output" in the most advanced country makes the workers' position more insecure than ever.

* * *

LABOUR BOMBS.

Mr. Fred. Montague (Under Minister for Air) is opposed to materialism—in philosophy. As a Labour Minister under the Capitalist system, however, he is a staunch materialist, and strongly defended spending nearly 18 millions on the Air Force, an increase of nearly a million on last year. The modern weapons of war are taking the form of more air forces, so this spiritual Air Minister brings in larger air estimates.

So the Labour Government is keeping up the pace for bombing planes and all the other deadly weapons of this Capitalist world.

* * *

LLOYD GEORGE "BEHIND" THE I.L.P.

"Mr. Lloyd George's article in the *Daily Express* this week strongly reinforces the I.L.P. policy, so closely associated with F. W. Jowett's name." These are the words of the *New Leader*—the I.L.P. paper. What better evidence of the I.L.P.'s Socialism can you have?—Mr. Lloyd George "reinforces I.L.P. policy." Perhaps that is Lloyd George's thanks to the I.L.P. for so long supporting his Budget and other Reform campaigns!

* * *

A COMMUNIST PROGRAMME.

- (1) Feeding all school children.
- (2) Unemployed men on slack time to be relieved from paying rates.
- (3) A school holiday on May 1st.
- (4) Joint action by unemployed and employed to force these demands.

This is the Communist Party programme in Fifehire (*Daily Worker*, March 14).

That is what they call uniting the workers for Revolution. The workers are to join together—not fighting for Socialism, but fighting for a school holiday on May 1st, etc.

Did the Third International spend large sums to develop such powerful Revolutionaries? C.

IMPERIALISM AND REVOLUTION

"Imperialism and World Economy," by N. Bucharin. Martin Lawrence. 6s.

This work was written by Bucharin in 1915, and its references to statistics are largely out of date. But the essential arguments are in the main true to-day. The development of Imperialism in its economic aspects, has been treated in many books, such as John A. Hobson's "Export of Capital" and also his work on "Imperialism." Bucharin's book covers much the same ground.

The discovery of raw materials in the backward parts of the world, together with a supply of cheap labour close at hand, gave a powerful impetus to the modern capitalist and banking company to invest abroad in search of a higher rate of profit. The rapid rise of large scale machine industry enabled the manufacturers to produce more than could be sold at home and a far-flung Empire provides a ready market for the goods.

Bucharin says little of the modern development of industry in the colonial and "backward" countries, resulting in a continual shrinkage in the world market.

The growth of trusts, cartels and monopolies is well sketched by Bucharin, much of his material being gathered from Hilferding's "Finance Capital." Bucharin shows how war results from the struggle for markets and for sources of raw materials. The last chapter indicates how greatly Bucharin counted on a revolt of the workers at the end of the war, but nobody who saw how easily the workers were gulled in the developed capitalist world had any grounds for believing that world revolution would result.

The Communists condemn Bucharin's book because he does not support the idea that the system is collapsing quickly. Bucharin bitterly opposed Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek and other leaders who built up an opposition group in Russia, but Bucharin afterwards joined the opposition himself and

held that Capitalism's "collapse" was not in sight.

The present-day "intellectuals" of Communism criticize Bucharin's book, alleging that he ignores colonial uprisings and internal conflicts. These "slogan merchants" ignore the fact that Lenin in his introduction to the book had no fault to find with it. The colonial revolts on which Communists based their hopes are largely beginnings of a struggle for national independence on the part of native employers and their allies and are not working class struggles for emancipation.

Modern Imperialism is a developed stage of capitalism rising out of the growth of productive forces in the hands of an exploiting class and the only way it can be abolished is by the working class struggling for, and establishing, Socialism. The Colonial revolts that were going to smash Imperialism become in the long run movements to build Capitalism in "backward" lands.

The chief fault with Bucharin's manner of writing is that his language is not simple, and he lacks the power to make his points clear and plain. A. KOHN.

HULL BRANCH.

The attention of readers in the Hull district is drawn to the formation of a Branch. All who wish to co-operate in the activities of the new Branch are asked to communicate to the Secretary, Mr. V. Coupland, at 287, Beverley Rd., Hull.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday ...	Clapham Common, 6 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m.
Monday ...	Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 7.30 p.m.
Wednesday ...	Stepney Green Station, 8 p.m. Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Forest Gate Station, 7.30 p.m.
Friday ...	Battersea, Beechmore Road, 8.15 p.m.
Saturday ...	Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

EDINBURGH.

Wednesdays ...	The Mound, 8 p.m.
Fridays ...	
Saturdays ...	
Sundays ...	The Mound, 8 p.m.

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT.

Sundays ...	West Bar 7.30 p.m.
--------------------	--------------------

GLASGOW DISTRICT.

Sundays ...	County Place, Paisley Cross, 7.15 p.m.
Tuesdays ...	Vulcan Street, Springburn, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays ...	Burgher Street, Parkhead, 8 p.m.
Thursdays ...	West Regent Street, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupal-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 82, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 89, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Tuesdays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 311. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, JULY, 1930.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WILL INDEPENDENCE HELP INDIA ?

Anyone who reads the English newspapers and also the journals which put the point of view of the Indian Nationalists, will find himself presented with two pictures of Indian affairs and Indian problems which clash very violently with each other. From the Indian side we are told that the 320 million people who live in that huge area are suffering great wrongs at the hands of tyrannical British authorities, and are united in a desire to overthrow foreign rule and establish their right to govern themselves outside or inside the British Empire as they may freely desire. It is admitted on all sides that millions of the peasants and workers in India are desperately poor, permanently undernourished, and subject to devastating diseases in time of famine. In 1918-1919, during an epidemic of influenza, the loss of life reached the enormous total of 12 millions, equal to about a quarter of the population of this country. And poverty is not the only evil which persists in India after generations of paternal British government and innumerable promises of benefits to be showered on the Indians by their foreign masters.

The Indian Central Committee (a body of influential Indians appointed to sit in conjunction with the Simon Commission) last year submitted its report (published by H.M. Stationery Office, 1929, Cmd. 3451). The Committee have something to say about the neglect of the British Government to fulfil its pledges in regard to education.

The primary education of the masses has . . . been repeatedly declared, during the last 75 years, to be the special care of the British Government in India. It is, therefore, worth while to examine the progress achieved in this direction during that period and to see how far it has kept pace with the repeated declarations of policy. . . . In 1917, that is, 63 years after

the despatch of 1854, only 2.59 per cent. of the total population were receiving instruction in recognised primary schools. . . . It is not surprising in the face of these facts that public opinion in India was profoundly disappointed with the rate of progress achieved, and became openly sceptical as to the professed intention of the Government in the matter. (Para. 24.)

The Committee rather cuttingly point out that the expenditure on education is about one-sixteenth of the expenditure on the army — "the true measure of the interest displayed by the Government in mass education."

According to the Indian Economic Enquiry Committee, which reported in 1925, only 8% of the population are literate.

WHO IS TO BLAME ?

Those who defend the British occupation of India do not deny that there is great poverty. They admit this and many other evils, but they reply that if British troops and British Government officials were withdrawn, India would cease to have any central government, and would lapse into anarchy. It would be at the mercy of the more warlike native races at home, or invading troops from outside. They point to the multiplicity of races and languages which exist in India; the bitter hatred between the conflicting religions; and the rigid caste system which prevails among the Hindus, and which results in millions of the so-called "Depressed Classes" occupying a position of the utmost degradation, aptly indicated by their name, "untouchables." British officials show that the methods of carrying on agriculture are shockingly primitive, and that any improvement is hindered by the native customs and religious observances. Ideas of sanitation and medicine are largely lacking, and in these and other respects the

Indians as a whole gain much from the British occupation. So say the defenders of the present system of government. All of this is set out at length in the Simon Commission Report, 1930.

What, then, are we to believe? Ought we to side with Gandhi, the leader of the Indian Nationalists, in condemning the English Government (as many well-meaning people in this country do), or ought we to take up the attitude which is maintained by successive British Prime Ministers, that it is necessary to remain in India for the good of the Indians? Let us consider the matter a little further, and start by asking ourselves why the British Government is in India at all. When we know why the World Powers are all of them anxious to acquire colonies and spheres of influence abroad, we shall be better able to see the Indian problem in its proper light.

WHY ARE BRITISH TROOPS IN INDIA?

The ultimate answer to this question is simply: "foreign trade and foreign investments." Every developed capitalist nation is faced with the same desperate problem of disposing abroad the surplus goods which its workers produce, but are too poor to buy. In every country there are a minority of rich people so wealthy that they cannot spend their vast incomes, and are perpetually seeking new foreign fields of profitable investment of the wealth which they cannot help saving. Every capitalist power needs, therefore, to find foreign markets and places for investment. This it is which leads to imperialism; to the conquest of the territory of "backward races"; to armaments; and finally to war.

Read what the late Mr. Joseph Chamberlain said on the subject in a speech delivered in 1890, before the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce—

All the great offices of State are occupied with commercial affairs. The Foreign Office and the Colonial Office are chiefly engaged in finding new markets and in defending old ones. The War Office and the Admiralty are mostly occupied in preparations for the defence of those markets and for the protection of our commerce.

This explains the British Colonial Empire. And what is true of Britain is just as true of other great powers—France, for example.

Listen to Marshal Lyauty, the French General who conquered Morocco—

French soldiers are fighting in Morocco to acquire territory in which rise rivers capable of supplying power for electrification schemes which

will prove of great advantage to French trade. When we have acquired the last zone of cultivatable territory; when we have nothing but mountains in front of us, we shall stop.

Our object is commercial and economic. The military expedition in Morocco is a means, not an end. Our object is the extension of foreign trade. ("Star," 31 October, 1922.)

Now let us turn to India and read what the Liberal "Manchester Guardian" has to say (30th December, 1929).

There are two chief reasons why a self-regarding England may hesitate to relax her control over India. The first is that her influence in the East depends partly upon her power to summon troops and to draw resources from India in time of need. . . . The second is that Great Britain finds in India her best market, and that she has a thousand million of capital invested there.

Lastly, think over the bombastic utterance of Sir William Joynson-Hicks, now Lord Brentford (quoted in the "Daily News" 17th October, 1925).

We did not conquer India for the benefit of the Indians. I know it is said at Missionary meetings that we conquered India to raise the level of the Indians. That is cant. We conquered India as the outlet for the goods of Great Britain. We conquered India by the sword, and by the sword we should hold it. (Shame.) Call it shame if you like. I am stating facts. I am interested in missionary work in India, and have done much work of that kind, but I am not such a hypocrite as to say that we hold India for the Indians. We hold it as the finest outlet for British goods in general, and for Lancashire cotton goods in particular.

When you add to this the influence of the English families who look to the Indian civil and military services to provide posts for their sons, it is easy enough to understand why a capitalist British Government does not want to lose India.

INDIAN CAPITALISTS OR INDIAN WORKERS?

We have seen why British capitalists are interested in Indian affairs—a £1,000 million is an accumulation of property worth fighting for. But now let us see what are the interests on the other side. Who are the interests behind Gandhi?

Sir Basil Blackett, an authority on Indian Finance, in a speech at New Delhi on March 19th, 1929, pointed out that the capital invested in India is rapidly being concentrated more and more into the hands of Indian capitalists. He said that between 60% and 70% of the shares in Indian jute mills are Indian-owned. Indian capitalists are investing in Government loans, developing India's production of steel and other

goods, financing India's foreign trade, and even investing money in other countries such as Brazil.

The Simon Commission in Volume I. of its Report (page 23) says:—

It was British capital that began the modern process of industrialism in India, but more and more commercial enterprise is falling into Indian hands. Most of the share capital in the jute mills on the Hooghly is Indian; the vast majority of the cotton factories of Bombay are Indian; and, while it was British enterprise which first established and developed the tea gardens of Assam and elsewhere, these undertakings are now carried on side by side with many that are Indian owned. India is now one of the eight most important industrial areas in the world. . . . Industrialism . . . is displacing the village craftsman, so that large-scale manufacture is being superimposed on the ancient fabric of an elaborately sub-divided and predominantly rural society.

Here we have the problem in a nutshell. Indian capitalists want to have the profits of the developing Indian capitalism for themselves. They wish to be able to control the Indian system of taxation, and the Indian system of tariffs, and use them to further their own interests. They do not object to the exploitation of the Indian workers, but they do object to British investors getting the lion's share; and they do object to British traders, exporting British-made goods to India, enjoying preferential treatment.

Fundamentally, the Indian Nationalist movement represents the interests of Indian capitalists. It is naturally supported by the Indian educated castes, who see the promise of fat jobs in the Indian Army or Civil Service, and in the legal profession.

As the "Manchester Guardian's" special Indian correspondent wrote on 7th February, 1930, Indian independence "would mean the government of India by men drawn almost entirely from the urban Hindu capitalist and professional classes." These are the men who control the Indian Nationalist movement.

WHAT SHOULD THE SOCIALISTS DO?

What, then, should be our attitude? We can give a plain and definite answer. On the one side we are in no way whatever responsible for or defenders of the actions of the British Government; nor do we associate ourselves in any way with the British Labour Party. We are working for Socialism, and for that alone. We claim that only the establishment of Socialism can solve the Indian problem, and all other problems of national rivalries. Only Social-

ism will rid the world of this murderous scramble for foreign markets, and thus remove the need for colonies and for armaments to seize and retain them.

To the Indian workers we extend our sympathy in the sufferings which fall to their lot. We ask them, however, to recognise that their poverty is the result not of foreign rule—which is merely one of the evil by-products of capitalism—but of the capitalist system itself. Dominion status or Independence for India will not solve any working class problem. It will merely be a substitution of "India for the Indian capitalists" in place of "India for the British capitalists." The only sound policy for the Indian workers, the only policy in line with their class interests, is to keep clear of the Nationalist movement, and carry on steadily with the task of organising themselves on the economic field for the defence of their interests against their employers, and organising on the political field for the ultimate achievement of Socialism in co-operation with the rest of the world's workers. There is nothing in the programme of Gandhi and the Indian Nationalists deserving of working class support. Therefore, just as we urged the British and German workers in 1914 to refuse to be drawn into the quarrel between British and German capitalist Governments, so now we urge the workers of this country and of India not to allow themselves to be led into conflict by the parties of capitalism in their respective countries. Our watchword is not "Britain for the British" and "India for the Indians," but "the world for the workers." H.

NOTICE...

"The Socialist"

We regret that our supply of the May issue of "The Socialist" did not reach us. We hope to be able to supply the May and June issues shortly.

A CONFERENCE

A Conference of Party Members will be held at Head Office, 42 Dover Street, on Saturday, July 26th to discuss the circulation of the "Socialist Standard" and the general propaganda activities of the Party. Members are urged to attend.

CAN WE GET SOCIALISM THROUGH PARLIAMENT?

When the Communist Party was formed some ten years ago, it absorbed elements which changed their names without thereby abandoning their illusions. One of the most obstinate of these was the notion that because the machinery of government is controlled now by those who use it to maintain capitalist domination, an attempt on the part of the workers to capture Parliament and use it for revolutionary ends is foredoomed to failure. In support of this view, we are frequently offered the phrase of Marx, "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." ("Civil War in France," p. 28. Labour Publishing Co.'s Edn.)

In the volume in question, Marx was dealing with a particular experience of the working class of Paris, the memorable Commune of 1871.

"Paris," said Marx, "had risen in arms against the attempt of Thiers and the Rurals to restore and perpetuate that old governmental power bequeathed to them by the Empire. Paris could resist only because in consequence of the siege it had got rid of the army and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of whom consisted of working men. This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. The first decree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people." (p. 30.)

This same standing army forms, along with the State police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judicature, one of the principal pillars of the State handed down by absolute monarchy to its Republican successors. Marx uses quite a lot of space in showing that the reason why these same Republicans required an instrument of oppression was that they represented an exploiting class, the modern capitalist class; while the working class, having no class beneath it to oppress, could but rid itself of this part of the State machinery as of a burden.

It is curious to note, in view of all this, that the Communist Party claims Russia as an example of how to achieve working-class emancipation; a country, that is, where these pillars of the State (standing army, political police, bureaucracy, law officers, etc.) still exist in full vigour. One would

imagine, if one took the declamations of "Communists" seriously, that Socialism consists of the domination of the workers over the capitalists; as though the former could "exploit" or in some other way make use of the latter. The fact that Russian society cannot at present dispense with the capitalists is the clearest possible proof of the economical, political and mental backwardness of that country, and the limited scope for working-class activity. The last thing that Marx intended to imply by his oft-quoted statement was that Socialism could be imposed upon a nation of peasants by means of a "Red Army"!

The Socialist Party of Great Britain has pointed out from its foundation in its declared principles that the existing State is "an instrument of oppression" which only the conscious political action of the organised working-class could "convert into an agent of emancipation." In other words, we have always advocated revolutionary political action. The latter-day "Communists," however, do not understand the meaning of this term. They do not appreciate the fact that revolution necessitates gaining control of the existing political machinery, not its mere destruction and the creation of something new out of nothing. Marx says, for instance, on page 32: "While the merely repressive organs of the old governmental power were to be amputated, its legitimate functions were to be wrested from an authority usurping pre-eminence over society itself, and restored to the responsible agents of society; instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for the workmen and managers in his business. . . . Nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the Commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchic investiture."

Marx, above all people, had none of the anarchists' contempt for "counting noses." Nor did he share the delusion that the revolution could be achieved merely by punching noses (!) at the command of self-appointed leaders. In their desperate scramble to remain within the shelter of Lenin's mantle the "Communists" of this and other countries have poured scorn upon voting, as a mere capitalist snare, without putting

forward any alternative which would bear five minutes' intelligent scrutiny.

Society can no more dispense with administrative machinery than it can do without the material means of living. It is quite easy and quite correct, at present, to describe a factory as a capitalist instrument, seeing that it is an institution for extracting profit from the labour of the workers therein. Those who advocate organisation by factory committees overlook this; but even they would hesitate to say, "Let us smash the factories of the employers and set up factories of our own."

Yet such a proposal would be quite as sane as the suggestion that we should destroy the State by means of "workers' councils" responsible to nobody but themselves. The publicly-elected administrative bodies are capitalist machines only so long as the workers regard capitalism as the necessary form of society. They can be converted into means of establishing Socialism so soon as the workers (i.e., the majority of the electors) realise its necessity.


This does not mean that every detail of industrial activity will be regulated by bureaucrats in Whitehall; but it does mean that the social revolution will be an organic development, not a mere chaotic breakdown. The class-conscious organisation of the workers has everything to gain and nothing to lose by democratic methods. Its development is in fact unthinkable without them, and when we are told that representative institutions, such as the ballot-box, are merely barometers, we smile.

Can one alter the political atmosphere by smashing the barometer?

The "Communists" take revenge for their rejection at the polls by denouncing polling as "a bourgeois device for deluding the workers," and then call on the latter to try conclusions with police-batons, and the only things that get smashed are the workers' heads.

We of the Socialist Party suggest that these latter can be put to better use. We have sufficient confidence in their contents to believe that they are capable of assimilating the Socialist message, and our whole policy is shaped accordingly.

E. B.

 **Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds.**

WEALTH!

"How much shall we and our guests spend on the wonderful social programme which began in May, and will continue till September?"

"It can hardly be less than £50,000,000; it may be far more."

"Wealthy Americans, accompanied by wives and children, spend £10 to £30 a day at London's luxury hotels. Rents up to £200 a week are paid for the more elaborate furnished West End houses at the height of the season."

("Daily News," 13/6/'30.)

CHURCHILL DISCOVERS OVERPRODUCTION.

In his Romanes Lecture delivered at Oxford on Thursday, June 19th, Mr. Winston Churchill made some interesting admissions about the inadequacy of the capitalist system, and about the inability of the economists to understand capitalism. The "Daily Telegraph" (20th June) reports him as follows:—

Mr. Churchill examined the classical doctrines of economics, with their insistence on private enterprise, individual effort, and non-interference by the State, and said that we could clearly see they did not correspond to what was going on now.

If, he proceeded, the doctrines of the old economists no longer serve for the purposes of our society, they must be replaced by a new body of doctrine equally well-related in itself, and equally well-fitting into a general theme.

The root problem of modern world economics was the strange discordance between the consuming and producing power. We were faced with the Curse of Plenty.

BIRTH CONTROL & UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Birth Control Movement have issued a leaflet explaining that France cured unemployment there by means of Birth Control.

Fewer babies—fewer out of work—prosperity—and plenty to eat at Nature's table.

It's very simple. Whilst curing unemployment, somehow they left most of the French workers in poverty.

Why are the numbers of out-of-works fewer in France?

The explanation must be sought in the economic position of the French population, as well as in the post-war reparation work in France, as well as her military situation. An article on this matter will appear shortly.

THE "NEW" SOCIALISM.

Mr. G. D. H. Cole, who explains how to "deal" with unemployment in the I.L.P. paper, *The New Leader*, also contributes a series to the columns of *Everyman Weekly*. One article is called "Socialism, Old and New," but his "Socialism" is neither old nor new—it may be Coleism, but it isn't Socialism. He explains that the old Socialist method was to nationalise industries. Not entirely nationalised, but some in State hands and others in private hands. Mr. Cole does not point out that Socialism means social or common ownership, and, therefore, does not mean Government or private ownership. But even Nationalisation is too strong for this I.L.P. contributor, who is now an economic advisor to the Labour Government! He explains the "New Socialism" thus:

Meanwhile, on their side, the Socialists have not been standing still. There has been an evolution of opinion among them fully as notable as that which has taken place among economists or employers. Broadly speaking, most Socialists (and nearly all the younger Socialists) have ceased to regard nationalisation in the old sense of the term, as something desirable in itself and inherent in Socialist policy, and have tended to transfer the emphasis of their argument from the need for national ownership of industry to the need for effective public control.

According to this, "Socialists" certainly haven't been standing still—but standing on their heads. Ownership is the basis of control, and while the workers do not own they will not control. While another class owns, that class will always control the workers' lives—by control of their means of living. Mr. Cole asks:

Can we not have, instead of nationalised industries in the old sense, great recognised public utility corporations working under social control, and co-ordinated into an efficient whole by means of a State economic agency? It does not need great changes and it may need no change of ownership at all, to convert the railway service into a public corporation of this sort.

Public Utility Corporations, controlled publicly—owned privately! That is the new Socialism. But America contains plenty of these firms, and they are just as much capitalist as any other concerns with the added monopoly power of vast businesses in control of the entire field. Exploitation of the worker and the large profits of the capitalist continue. Public control, what is that? Where it is not ordinary Government regulation it may be State, employers and workers represented on a board. And as the

State is the agent of the capitalist—as Labour Rule as well as Tory Rule shows—the workers' voice is in a minority—especially when the so-called workers' representative is usually a Labour leader looking out for a "future" for himself.

Later in the article Mr. Cole confesses that his new "Socialism" is simply the old capitalism. For he instances two so-called publicly controlled businesses in this country in which "public" control was established by Tories and Liberals. He says:

"Socialists are apt to forget that the railways and electricity Acts of late years were passed by anti-Socialist Governments."

No, we do not forget—Socialists remember and know that Liberals and Tories and Labour tools of capital will establish Government regulation of large utilities in order to harmonise these services with the general interests of the capitalists who use these utilities.

The railways—Mr. Cole's own illustration—are privately owned. And the real control lies in the owners of the largest shares who decide by the number of shares how the railways shall be run. In the interest of the Traders the Government regulates their charges, but does not stop them making profits out of their employees who do the work.

Labour misleaders, like Mr. Cole, will confuse the workers with false ideas of Socialism. The function of the Socialist is to explain the nature of Capitalism and Socialism. Capitalism under private or public control means a working class working for wages (when it pays the capitalist to employ them). It means a parasite class living on profits in the forms of dividends on shares, public loans, etc., which all come out of the results of the workers' labours.

Government control or ownership does not alter that.

Socialism means common ownership by the workers of the means of producing wealth, and also of the product.

Many who don't know, think that the object of the Labour Party is common ownership. Others think that it is only Government ownership of industries. The truth emerges that the object of these alleged Labourites is public control, thus leaving ownership as well as control safely in the hands of the owning class. Liberals, Tories and "Labour" can unite on this; and when this capitalist objective is achieved the working class will be where they are now—slaves of capitalism.

K.

THE CLOAK OF RELIGION.

In the eyes of the class that is supreme in society, religion is for the people, as Napoleon once pointed out, but not for the rulers. It is something to stupefy or drive into a frenzy the mass of the people, as the needs of the governing class demand.

Since the days of the native medicine man religion has been a prop and a handmaiden to each ruling class, and a priestly group has evolved parallel with the growth of government. So much has this been so that each social revolution of the past has had a religious glamour cast over it and has involved modifications of the creeds of the defeated rulers.

Apart from its philosophic unsoundness, the success and the curse of religion has been its propagation of the myth of another world.

When the oppressed are weary from the hopeless struggle for existence, and might be moved to rise and throw off the yoke of oppression, the deadening hand of religion stretches out to them, bids them to be of good cheer and be patient, all will be well in the hereafter, where "all good people" will live in a heavenly rose garden. Many rise to the bait, as it is so comforting to think that this vale of tears is but a path to paradise. And so places of worship have arisen, palatial, beautiful and impregnated with incense; their pulpits have resounded with the mocking cry, "Come unto me all ye who labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest." The promise has meant a good deal to those who looked for no rest on this side of the tomb, and has helped to blind them to the possibilities of rest in their real life.

Religion has not been a giver of rest but a scourge to drive the masses on to toil unresistingly. The demonstrations of scientists that religion is, on the one hand, an attempt of the ignorant to explain natural forces—of whose workings they are ignorant, and, on the other hand, a weapon in the hands of a ruling class to help to keep the workers in subjection—have made little progress in the workers' minds in the past, because knowledge has been the privilege of the rulers and their henchmen, and the masses have lacked time and opportunity to learn.

In the later Middle Ages the ruling class in their own circle ignored the precepts they preached and permitted a considerable amount of scepticism in the writings of the

professional groups, cynically conscious of the fact that it would never reach the understanding of the "lower orders."

Of late years a change has gradually come, and from two directions; both of which are due to the profit-making root of present society—and are beyond the power of capitalism to cope with.

One cause is the mighty machine industry of to-day, which has demonstrated to workers, without the need of books, the natural source of supernatural phenomena, and, at the same time, the power of human capacity to harness the forces of nature. The oil engine, wireless, and the aeroplane have been among the remarkable educators of the average man during recent years.

The other cause is the cheap and wholesale production of literature which brings within reach of all, often in a very handy form, the very latest results of scientific investigation in all fields of thought, and also lays bare the method of scientific research.

Books are articles of commerce, like other commodities, and money invested in printing yields just the same kind of profit as money invested in oil production or any other ware. Consequently, newspapers print scientific reports and works of a scientific nature are written because the sale of newspapers and books is profitable. Workers read and learn, and their growing wisdom is reflected in a gradually clearer understanding of the world and their particular place in it.

Thus the blind scramble after profit leads the capitalist to dig the grave of his system, and, as the hold of superstitions weakens, the worker loses his reverence and respect for the things that he has been taught to regard as the eternal institutions of divine wisdom. Religion, like a cloak, is thrown off when it is worn threadbare. In similar fashion, the system whose evils it has been used to cover is subjected to scientific examination, and failing to provide for the needs of the majority is displaced by one that does so.

GILMAC.

WANTED: A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*. Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

JULY,



1930

WHAT THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT HAS DONE**A WORD TO THOSE WHO VOTED LABOUR.**

It is now a year since the Labour Party took governmental office. They came in to solve unemployment. They have failed, and have proved by their failure the emptiness of their professions. The unemployed problem is still growing greater. The peaceful professions of Labour leaders are offset by the bombings of Indian peoples, and increased attention given to preparedness for aerial warfare.

As far as can be seen, the principal achievement of the Labour Government is the provision of fat jobs for some of its supporters.

Many workers gave support to the Labour Party on the ground that it was doing "something now"! which would bring us nearer to the realisation of our aims and hopes. In fact, however, the Labour Government has shown itself as the legitimate heir to the place and policy of the dying Liberal Party. It was never Socialist, though some of its leading members toyed with the name.

There were some who hailed the triumph of Labour as the beginning of the end of Capitalism. They have suffered a delusion, and unfortunately, in many instances, with the awakening, has come a feeling of despondency and disgust with everything; an

attitude of mind that is summed up in the bitter remark, "What is the good of anything?"

The position is somewhat similar to the feeling aroused after the Russian Bolshevik movement changed its direction and commenced to build State capitalism in Russia. First reached Europe, there were many who saw in it the commencement of the imminent social revolution, shook hands with each other and joyfully hailed the dawn of the new era. But it was a false dawn, and as the darkness again gathered, their joy gave place to despair, and, in some cases, to a cynical attempt to make profit out of the situation that developed.

Among the supporters of the Labour Party are numbers of working men and When the news of the Bolshevik uprising women who have given all they had in energy and money to an honest and whole-hearted support of that party. Misled by emotional appeals, and failing to grasp the fundamental facts of the workers' position, they expected from the Labour Party what it could not accomplish—and what many of its leaders knew it could not accomplish. For twelve months they have been hoping against hope that something really important would be done to grapple with their oppressive conditions, but all they have been met with are photographs of Labour leaders in court dress smirking at them from the daily papers.

We ask these disillusioned supporters of the Labour Party not to give way to despair, and not to meet our attempts at explaining Socialism with hostility based on the false idea that our principles are like those of the Labour Party. We ask them instead to refrain from judgment until they have read our literature. When they have done so, they will find that we have been pointing out to the workers what to expect from Labour leaders for the last twenty-five years. And the result has proved the truth of our contentions. They will also learn why it is that we have opposed the Labour Party and, if they are prepared to give our case a little careful thought, its fundamental soundness will be borne in upon them.

Here is the basis of the case in a few words:

The worker sells to the capitalist his labour-power for a weekly or daily wage. After a few hours' work the worker has reproduced the value of his day's wages.

But the capitalist has paid him for a day's work, or a week's work, as the case may be, and consequently the worker continues working until he completes the period. The value he produces during the further hours of work is "surplus value," which does not cost the capitalist anything, yet goes into his pocket. It is this fact that splits society into two opposing classes—a small number of wealthy on the one hand, owning the means of production; and the vast majority of society on the other hand, owning only their power to work. Until this class organisation of society is changed by a fundamental revolution abolishing the private ownership of the means of production, there cannot be a permanent improvement in the condition of the working class. Attempts at amelioration by fiddling with secondary matters are like trying to abolish a tempest by pouring a few barrels of oil on the sea.

THE ILLUSIONS OF SIR OSWALD MOSLEY.

Sir Oswald Mosley has resigned from the Labour Ministry and made a great noise with his proposals to deal with unemployment. Though they are largely taken from the official Labour programme (Labour and the Nation) the Mosley plans are criticised and opposed by "official" Labour. An examination of his schemes shows that they are borrowed very largely from the Liberal Party programme, and hence Lloyd George sings their praise.

Raising the school age, pensioning some workers over 60, and making roads, bridges, etc.—these comprise the cream of Mosley's programme.

Do they deal with the cause of unemployment? Will they absorb the unemployed? Will they stop industry adding to the army of out-of works? The answer is No! Like Lloyd George's platform call, "We can conquer unemployment," the Mosley schemes play with effects and merely carry on the ordinary repair work the capitalists need to make their industry more effective.

Take cheap wage slaves over 60 out of the factory. Does that mean younger and more expensive workers will be employed instead?

Past experience shows that women and machinery will be used to keep down costs whenever production expenses are raised by legislation or Union activity. Young boys

and girls taken out of the factory will provide another inducement to rationalisation by means of machinery, etc., and so, instead of older workers being employed, cheaper methods of production will prevent the increased employment of older workers.

Mosley and Lloyd George schemes—like the Labour Party policy, official or otherwise—simply mean that the ordinary and normal work of making repairs to capitalism is boomed as special relief work. Where it is not that, it is like making new roads—an attempt to increase the efficiency of capitalist production and distribution of goods.

Thirty shillings per week as a retirement pension may sound inspiring to Mr. Mosley, the millionaire, but it simply means the most pressing poverty for a married couple after a lifetime of toil.

Lloyd George and the Liberal manufacturers are uniting with the Labour Party on a common capitalist programme, not to solve unemployment—but to capture votes and pretend they are helping the workers. Both Liberal, Labour and Tory pin their hopes on rationalisation, which increases unemployment faster than relief work provides work.

None of these parties of capitalism face the fact that modern industry constantly and continuously produces an unemployed army of workers. The only way to cure unemployment is to stop the cause—the class ownership of the means of production.

A. K.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE.

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 86, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153, Blackfriars Road, S.E.
D. A. McLean, 17, Union Street, Belfast.
W. Pryer, 25 St. Leonards Street, Bromley-by-Bow.
A. C. Gray, 7, Abbey Street, Bermondsey, S.E.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from
Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand
House, W.C.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

IS CHRISTIANITY "FIZZING OUT"?

We have received from a reader the letter which is printed below:—

Clapton, E.5. 31/5/30.

Dear Sir, To the Editor.
I am a regular reader of the STANDARD, and admire the good sense in most of the articles, but I should like to know if the writer of the article on religion in the April issue includes the Cross as a religion; if he did, I should think he requires a dose of logic. If the circulation of a party's organ is any criterion to go by, there is no evidence at present of a "fizzing out" of the Christian religion. Last year's world sale of the Bible was 42,000,000. Compare this with 30 years ago and you will find a good increase. I am sure he must be at sea a little.

All modern movements for the uplifting of the worker received their impulse from the religion of Christ, and probably the writer of "fizzing out" would not have the ability to write if it was not for our religion.

In conclusion, I should advise you to improve your articles on religion if you wish to maintain your good reputation.

God Bless You. Yours very sincerely,
H. F. ROBERTS.

P.S.—I should be glad if you would let me know if the religion of Jesus helped Amy Johnson.

OUR REPLY.

It is good to hear that Mr. Roberts is a regular reader of our paper. Long may he remain so. We are always glad to hear from our readers, either in criticism or in approval. Anything is better than a devastating silence. It is heartening to feel that the thoughts one hatches and commits to paper, find a response somewhere; that someone is moved to throwing either bouquets or bricks. The article to which Mr. Roberts takes exception was largely composed of the thoughts of others. First, an extract from the "Daily News" described the "unholy scramble for jobs" amongst the professional Christians. Then an extract from Robert Graves' "Good-bye to All That," in which he stated that under the test of war, the professional Christian was often a contemptible creature. Finally, there was a series of extracts from Haldane's "Possible Worlds," confirming Graves' observations, and adding that the modern clergy are recruited from the dregs of the universities and that their income is diminishing and not likely to increase. Our restrained comment was, "Knowledge and correct action will kill capitalism; religion will flicker out."

Mr. Roberts disagrees. He thinks we require a "dose of logic"; that we are at sea

a little. As for logic—well, what are we to gather from the mention of 42,000,000 Bibles? Does Mr. Roberts believe there will be 42,000,000 more Christians than before? And will they differ materially from the Christians we meet every day? And will they behave any differently in the next war from that described by Graves and Haldane? 42,000,000 Bibles in one year is certainly a staggering figure, but what is quite as staggering is the futility of it all. What becomes of them? Where do they go? Cross-word puzzlers must account for quite a lot, and in the tropics white ants must make a difference. The armies that have sprung up consequent upon the Christian treaties following the war would also affect the Bible market. You don't see the connection?

Then you must have another quotation, this time from Brigadier-General Crozier's "A Brass Hat in No Man's Land." He describes the use which the military authorities made of the Chaplains and their religious ceremonies and beliefs, in the following pointed phrase:—"The Christian Churches are the finest blood-lust creators which we have, and of them we made free use."

However, we need not labour the point. The final enquiry of Mr. Roberts as to whether the religion of Jesus helped Amy Johnson, is one upon which, up to the time of writing, we have no exact knowledge. Our only source of information, the daily newspaper, has only mentioned petrol so far, and this appears to have been sufficient. We have never heard of the religion of Jesus being used in the way suggested, or undoubtedly Major Segrave would have availed himself of it in his similar desperate enterprise.
W. T. H.

* * *

There is rather an amusing commentary on the wide circulation of Bibles in that very religious country—the U.S.A.

The Gideon Bible Society—sometimes called the Giddy ones—collect funds from the rich to supply a Bible free to every room in every hotel, so that commercial travellers may have some spiritual consolation for lack of orders. It has often been noted that whilst articles of any value whatever are constantly stolen—the Bible is always left behind. And the only evidence of its nice, clean pages being disturbed, is the rude remarks scribbled in the margins.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

MR. J. H. THOMAS AND THE UNEMPLOYED.

Mr. Thomas has proved himself once more the friend of the employers. How grateful they must feel to good old Jimmy.

The "Daily News" of May 5th, 1930, reports a part of a speech given by him to his constituents at Derby. Speaking of rationalisation, he says; "It will temporarily result in unemployment, but if I am satisfied that it is a remedy, and that the ultimate effects will be of lasting benefit, then my policy is not to refuse anything that is temporarily unpopular or unpleasant. I am prepared to risk the unpopularity, knowing it must succeed." Furthermore he says: "We have to have a drastic process of rationalisation," and then, "Protection has been suggested as a remedy for unemployment, but protectionist countries were suffering the same trouble. Regard must be had to the conditions of employment in competing countries." "French, German, and Belgian workers could not be allowed to be exploited for our benefit." And, finally, he remarks; "If women abolished short skirts, they would make the greatest possible contribution to the revival of the Lancashire cotton trade."

What a noble and pathetic picture he makes as he prepares to sacrifice his popularity for an ideal, the ideal of rationalisation. How ignorant, or wilfully blind to the true facts he must be, when he insists that only temporary unemployment will result. Better and speedier methods of production mean that less labour is required, and if Mr. Thomas grants this, but says that the cheapening of the product will mean a bigger demand and the reabsorption of the displaced labour, then he must have forgotten, in the strenuous duties as a Minister, his experiences as a trade union leader. His dealing with the employers must have shown him how, when the cost of living decreases, wages fall. If wages fall, then the purchasing power of the workers in employment is no greater, and again, there is the fact of those thrown out by the rationalisation process, have their spending powers considerably decreased. Hence the increased demand is a myth, and Mr. Thomas has simply helped the bosses to displace labour and produce more cheaply, not temporarily, but permanently. The improvements that are made are never lost,

but are the stepping stones to greater efficiency. His argument on Protection can, with the same reasoning, be applied to rationalisation. "Protection is no cure, because protectionist countries are suffering the same trouble." Rationalisation is shown to be no cure, because rationalised countries are suffering just the same trouble. Rationalisation has gone on extensively in America, and on this the "Daily News" of January 14th, 1930, makes interesting reading. Two columns are devoted to unemployment in America, but just a short quotation will suffice:—

The causes of this huge displacement of workers (nearly 4,000,000) are declared to be (1) Improvements in machinery, (2) the extension of cheap electric power, (3) the invention of labour-saving devices, (4) the processes described in Gt. Britain under the name of Rationalisation. Hundreds of thousands of these dispossessed men and women have found work in new and growing industries, but the new industries have not been sufficient to absorb the displaced labour. The situation is one that has a marked significance for Great Britain, because similar developments in the use of labour-saving machines and Rationalisation are, in the opinion of many, bound to have similar consequences. The problem of what to do with men and women "scrapped" by the relentless new machines, is baffling the best brains in American industry. It is like a gaunt spectre in the richest country in the world, and distinguished economists say that the situation must inevitably grow more acute as time goes on.

What does Mr. Thomas say in the face of these facts? He just owlishly blinks and turns to the ladies. If we do what he asks, our frantic endeavours to free our legs from our petticoats should melt a heart of stone, and perhaps Mr. Thomas will excuse us from being the saviours of the Lancashire cotton trade. The cotton traders, however, put the trade depression down to something more serious than short skirts. The day after the article on unemployment in America, our useful little guide, the "Daily News" of January 13th, 1930, reports the following opinion of those interested in cotton:—

We have too much machinery. This carries with it a capacity for producing more than the market will take, and a consequent readiness of makers to sell their yarn and cloth at uneconomic prices in order to keep a foothold in the market.

Then since in this report they are not concerned with the workers, they go on to suggest that rationalisation, the elimination of small trading concerns, and the combining together of all the cotton

interests so as to eliminate waste, etc., is the method by which the capitalists can save their industries. The "Manchester Guardian" of 25th April, 1930, reports that the National Union of Shop Assistants were discussing the dismissal of elderly assistants through the amalgamation of firms, i.e., rationalisation. The amount of labour affected assumes gigantic proportions, and cannot be dismissed so lightheartedly as Mr. Thomas would dismiss it. This rationalisation, upon which Mr. Thomas confers his blessing so assiduously, means that industry will become centred in fewer and fewer hands. The spoils will be less divided. The most efficient methods of production will be utilised, reducing labour to a minimum. Commodities must be produced cheaply if they are to compete with foreign rivals, and if British capitalists are going to secure overseas trade. Whether or no foreign workers are exploited more than British workers, only concerns Mr. Thomas in so far that it means that foreign capitalists will prosper at the expense of British capitalists, and make Mr. Thomas' position more precarious. A point, however, in all this that Mr. Thomas never mentions, and which we must perforce bring to his notice, is his lack of concern over the position of the workers who are not unemployed. The vast majority are certainly not living in the lap of luxury, or does Mr. Thomas think that to have a job even at two pounds ten is the pinnacle of ambition realised? The workers employed and unemployed are in a position of poverty and insecurity. Knowledge and skill do not count now as they did formerly, and robots are more and more displacing higher paid labour.

Is Mr. Thomas concerned? Not in the least. He just smilingly prates about unpopular temporary effects, and urges the workers to support the employers in dismissing them.

Mr. Thomas himself is in a singularly happy position, and no doubt this it is which enables him to bear up so blithely under other people's miseries. After failing for a year to carry out his promise of reducing unemployment, and seeing it in fact increase stupendously, Mr. Thomas leaves one Cabinet job for another equally highly paid. Workers who lose their jobs are not so fortunate.

MRS. O.

WHAT RATIONALISATION MEANS TO THE WORKERS.

"The Times" for May 12th and the six following days published a series of articles on "Rationalisation." The reason put forward for the articles was the failure of English industries to adapt themselves to post-war conditions by increased combination, cutting out the middleman and adopting massed production.

For ten years industries in this country have been faced with a depression that threatens to become permanent. The writers of "The Times" articles have no remedy to offer apart from capturing a larger share in the world market by becoming more efficient than foreign competitors. They instance Germany and America in particular, as countries that have forged ahead of England through adopting rationalisation. The four to six million unemployed in America and the growing tide of unemployment in Germany is an immediate reply to them, and also a prophecy of what the future promises to the English worker.

"The Times" editorial defines rationalisation as follows:—

Brought down to its simplest terms, Rationalisation is nothing more or less than the technique of reducing costs. The first stage of this process consists in the elimination of unnecessary and wasteful competition by the formation of cartels to regulate production and to equate supply with demand, and the combination of producing units in "horizontal" amalgamations. Once this has been successfully accomplished, the way is open for a very large number of economies. Among the more obvious of these sources of saving are the suppression of redundant staffs and middlemen, through centralised buying and selling, the reduction of unnecessary specifications through more adequate standardisation, the closing down of obsolete plant, and the concentration of production on the best-equipped units, which can be kept working continuously on a single type of product, thus avoiding a great deal of wasteful duplication. In the sphere of labour costs the economies made possible by amalgamation are in some respects even more important. The credit resources of big combines render possible large and frequent renewals of fixed capital and consequently enable the most modern labour-saving devices to be adopted on a scale which is impracticable for smaller units.

A careful examination of the above quotation will make the fact evident that the essence of rationalisation is the production and distribution of a given quantity of goods by the employment of less labour than is required at present. A proof of this

is given in the fourth article, where the writers point out that in the United States, by mass production, the output per man employed is much higher than in this country.

The claim made on behalf of rationalisation is that it will bring back "prosperity" to this country. The hollowness of the claim is exposed by the following quotation, taken from the first article:—

Taking the world in general, the increase in productive capacity of the basic industries since 1913 has been far greater than growth in the volume of international trade. The various nations of Europe and Asia, to say nothing of the United States, have striven hard to attain a far greater degree of economic self-sufficiency. India, China, and Japan, for instance, have vastly increased their production of cotton goods; Germany has gone far towards replacing the plant which she lost owing to the transfer of Alsace and Lorraine to France; Spain and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe; Brazil and Argentina, not to mention India and Australia, have all been building up manufacturing industries of their own behind tariff barriers. The competition in the export of manufactured goods has consequently grown keener.

The irony of the situation is that the real cause of the depression, which is now international and promises to be permanent, is the fact that international production has far outgrown the world's demands. The growth of rationalisation tends to make matters worse. The obvious trend of industrial affairs to-day is towards international combinations and the splitting up of the world's markets among a few immense combines, which would restrict and accelerate production to meet the demands of the market. This will bring in its train a huge body of permanently unemployed that will become more and more menacing to each capitalist nation, and it will tax the ingenuity of future statesmen pretty heavily to find means to keep this huge body quiet and amused.

That any one nation can secure a large part of the international market for any appreciable length of time against competing nations is now practically impossible. The vast strides made in the rapid gathering and diffusion of technical knowledge puts the leading nations on a level basis and prevents one nation from forging ahead of another. In the earlier days of modern industry, England, for various reasons, obtained a flying start and was for a while the manufacturing nation of the world. But the time has passed by when any nation

could emulate England. In the heyday of England's commercial prosperity, British manufacturers supplied foreign countries with the plant, machinery and technical education which are now being used by them to meet their own productive demands and secure a share of other markets.

The present trouble in India, which the Labour Government are handling in true accord with "the imperishable ideals of British statesmanship," has its root in the fact that Indian industrialists have become conscious of the commercial importance of their steel, cotton and other industries and want a place in the sun—or, in other words, a fair share of the plums!

At bottom, then, rationalisation is a move to bring the control of industry internationally into the hands of fewer and fewer people and thereby to tighten the bonds of slavery more closely upon the world's workers. While on the one hand it aims at easing the present anarchy in production by adjusting supply to effective demand, and also tends to make production more efficient by technical and organisational improvement; on the other hand, it aims at making the worker produce more wealth for less wages and increasing the already huge unemployed army. The chasm between the working class and the capitalist class grows ever greater and greater, and can only be bridged by the abolition of the capitalist order of society—as Karl Marx so clearly pointed out many years ago.

There is an illuminating side to the wholesale movement for rationalisation. For decades the standing reproach flung at the Socialist was the charge that he proposed to abolish the small capitalist—that mythical being who is supposed to have raised himself from the ranks by personal effort and was alleged to be a steadily growing fraction of the community. He has no place, however, in the rationalised scheme of things, he is to be crushed out—the rationalisers make no bones about it! And he is to be crushed out because he is a hindrance in modern production. Ethical views do not count where economic interests are at stake. It remains now for the working class to point out to the capitalists that they also have become a hindrance to production, as they cannot organise their system to provide adequately for all members of society. GILMAC.

Contributions are invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

A LOOK ROUND.

"RED" LEADER TURNS GREEN! ANOTHER "COMMUNIST HOPE" GONE.

Under the heading of "Larkin not a Communist," the Communist *Daily Worker*, March 12th, reports a meeting addressed on March 9th in Dublin for the Workers' Union. Talking of the approach of St. Patrick's Day, Larkin said, "This nation needs a spiritual uplifting." He then praised the Government's famous prison, Mountjoy—as "the best prison in the world."

Another statement was, "I am not a Communist and I know very little about Capitalism." Larkin finished by asking the audience to remove their hats and sing the Free State national anthem.

The *Daily Worker*, with its usual confusion, says: "Larkin's renegacy removes one of the obstacles to the formation of a real Communist Party in Ireland."

It is not long since Jim Larkin went to Moscow and was elected to the Executive of the Third International. To give an International flavour to this body the five or six calling themselves the Communist League of Ireland were taken into the Third International, and Larkin, with his notorious nationalism, catholicism, and Labourism, was at once pushed on the Executive of the World Communist International. That alone shows how anti-revolutionary the Third International is, apart from the long string of adventurers who became leaders in its ranks. Willie Gallacher and Larkin were usually in close company and the anti-Socialist ideas of Larkin were well known to the other "Communist" Leaders.

It was common knowledge that Larkin in New York was busy supporting the formation of a Labour Party there, and talked of the great work of the British Labour Party, keeping silent on how the Labour Party here had betrayed the transport workers in 1913, when appealed to by Larkin himself for assistance in the struggle.

Larkin is a member of the Catholic Church and always pointed out that he was "a good member of mother church."

That did not stop his enlistment into the Bolshevik International, but now, when his church is busy denouncing Bolshevism, Larkin falls in to the Pope's call. Such are

the great recruits to the Communist Party. It is not surprising, therefore, to hear from such a Catholic stronghold as the Free State that Bob Stewart, the Communist official in Dublin, recently spoke there, and said that Russia was fighting the Greek Orthodox Church only, and not the Holy Catholic Religion. How similar are Jesuits and "Communists" in their handling of truth, with their doctrine, "the end justifies the means."

CAPITALISTS CAN'T GIVE DETAILS— BUT THEY ASK US FOR THEM.

How often do opponents demand details of life under Socialism? They insist upon blue prints of the future before they will support Socialism, regardless of the fact that those details depend upon the conditions, knowledge, and wishes of the population under Socialism.

The Capitalists, however, ask for support of their policies, but even on trumpery reform measures they decline to prophesy details. Listen to Lord Melchett in his book on "Imperial Economic Unity," advocating Empire Free Trade and asking for support now:

If at this stage I am asked whether my policy involves a tax on this or that, I decline to answer, because that is a question which can be answered only after the problem of each commodity has been investigated from every point of view.

Push that in front of the next anti-Socialist who wants details of an entire social system.

WHO'S TO HAVE THE BEST POISON GAS!

The Duchess of Hamilton in her article in the *Sunday Express* (March 2nd) against Vivisection complains bitterly against the War Office under a Labour Government, experimenting by means of poison gas on animals at a Salisbury Plain military experimental camp. Cats, monkeys, goats, horses, etc., are used to test the efficiency of poison gas. The Editorial of the same paper, commenting on the leisured lady's article, says that "it is no use suggesting that such experiments should not be conducted in this country when they are conducted in other countries. Such a course would merely place this country at a disadvantage."

Has not Professor Levinstein, of the Chemical Industry, told us that poison gas in war is more humane and kills quicker—possibly more.

What would the noble lady have the Labour Government do? What is a War Office for? It is to prepare for War—for markets, territory, etc., wanted by Capitalists.

She doesn't oppose war, but war on cats, etc. A Labour Government must carry on the research, or how otherwise would they get the best poison gas ready for the next war. These scientific men employed by the Government used 1184 animals for poison gas experiments between November 1st, 1926, and April 20th, 1929.

The Duchess asks that poison gas should be suppressed. She expects war to be carried on more "humanely." She doesn't suggest war should be abolished by removing the cause. That would be utopian. It is quite scientific to agree to preparations for wars as long as you kill in a gentlemanly way, such as sticking a bayonet in another man's stomach or dropping bombs. The Labour Government must continue poison gas experiments, of course, because every other capitalist government is doing the same! So the *Sunday Express* comes to the defence of the Laboural Government!

"THE COMMUNITY SPIRIT."

Mr. Ramsay McDonald presided at the Annual Dinner of the London Morayshire Club on March 1st, and among the guests were Lord Inchcape, Lord Furness, Sir Alexander Grant, and several other millionaire exploiters and opponents of the working class. So we learn from the *Daily Herald* (March 2nd).

This is the "United Front" of "Labour" and Capital. No class war spirit there.

THE SMALL SHOPKEEPER FINISHED!

"10,000 shopkeepers mainly trading in the villages and small towns of Britain, have gone bankrupt during the past year."

"Bankruptcies among small shopkeepers have increased 50 per cent. since the war," said the manager of a trade protection agency.

These two quotations from the *Sunday Express* (March 2nd), shows how the large

stores have benefited by increased travelling facilities which brings the customers into the bigger cities.

The Capitalist Press are compelled to admit that the "small man" has no chance to-day. Only a week before the same paper told us about the rich men who started with nothing. Now they confess that modern competition causes large numbers to finish up "with nothing."

C.

ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT.

A MOLE (MANCHESTER). The statement that "the very development of capitalism makes socialism more inevitable" was not an error. The phrase will be explained in our next issue.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All correspondents must enclose their name and address to ensure their letters receiving a reply in this journal. A nom-de-plume may be used for publication and all matter should be written on one side of the paper.

If the anonymous correspondent who has sent some questions on Marx, will send his name and address together with actual references to Marx's Capital, we will then be able to deal with his letter.

HULL BRANCH.

The attention of readers in the Hull district is drawn to the formation of a Branch. All who wish to co-operate in the activities of the new Branch are asked to communicate to the Secretary, Mr. V. Coupland, at 287, Beverley Rd., Hull.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday	Clapham Common, 6 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m. Southwark, Trinity Street, 7.30 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 11.30 a.m.
Tuesday	Southwark, Trinity Street, 7.30 p.m.
Wednesday	Stepney Station, 8 p.m. Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Forest Gate Station, 7.30 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 7.30 p.m.
Friday	Battersea, Beechmore Road, 8.15 p.m.
Saturday	Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

EDINBURGH.	
Wednesdays	The Mound, 8 p.m.
Fridays	
Saturdays	
Sundays	The Mound, 8 p.m.

GLASGOW DISTRICT.	
Sundays	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.
Thursdays	Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA**.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE**.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM**.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CENTRAL**.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- EAST LONDON**.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW**.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.
- HACKNEY**.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.
- ISLINGTON**.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.
- LEYTON**.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER**.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month, 7.45 p.m.
- PADDINGTON**.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).
- SHEFFIELD**.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA**.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- SOUTHWARK**.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- TOOTING**.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM**.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW**.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD**.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.
- WEST HAM**.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N.8. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Monday in month at 242, High Road, 8.30 p.m.

WOOLWICH.—Communications to Secretary at Head Office.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 312. Vol. 26.]

LONDON, AUGUST, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

SOCIALISM AND BIRTH CONTROL.

HAS FRANCE ABOLISHED UNEMPLOYMENT ?

Recently the claim has been made that poverty and unemployment have been abolished in France, and one of the explanations given for this achievement—a surprising one if true—is the popularisation of Birth Control. Before we examine this to see what there is in it which might be copied in this country, it will be necessary to glance at the causes of unemployment.

It is really not at all a difficult problem. We do not need to look for a solution at the uttermost ends of the earth, because it is here, right before our eyes.

Being workers, we know that most of us get just about enough pay at the end of the week or the month to enable us and our families to live. We spend what we get as soon as we get it, a case of hard come and easy go. Most workers do not save anything worth mentioning because they cannot afford it. The rich are in precisely the opposite situation; they save money because they cannot help it. Many of them get much more than they can possibly spend in spite of their big houses, their servants, their expensive cars, expensive foods, and luxurious ways of living generally.

The surplus they re-invest. The effect of this is that instead of the incomes of the wealthy being used to buy the goods which the factories can produce in such vast quantities, their money is used to build more factories and instal still more efficient labour-displacing machinery, thus adding to the army of the unemployed. This is a permanent feature of the capitalist system, and it is an illusion to think that this or that capitalist country has somehow escaped the common fate.

○ HOW UNEMPLOYMENT IS DISGUISED.

But although the politicians who seek to perpetuate capitalism cannot get at the root causes of unemployment, they have dis-

covered many devices for mitigating the effects of those causes. In general, the devices are of two kinds. One kind consists in withdrawing workers from the labour market and keeping them unoccupied (or occupied on non-productive work); the other kind depends for its effect on the ability to make the wealthy spend their money by appealing to their sympathy, their patriotism, or their fears.

Thus we see Liberals, Tories, and the Labour Party busily engaged in popularising rival schemes for raising the school age, or for further old-age pensions, with the object of withdrawing old and young from the labour market. Large numbers of workers are subtracted from the army of unemployed, dressed in uniforms, and called soldiers and sailors. The capitalist class will tolerate the expenditure of their money on keeping hundreds of thousands of soldiers strenuously engaged in producing nothing, much more readily than they will tolerate spending smaller sums of their money on the other unemployed army, those without uniforms who line up at the Labour Exchanges. Expenditure on armaments, on charities, on wars, on missions, and on war service pensions, are all instances of devices which help to obscure the full extent of capitalism's great problem, the problem of the wealthy with so much money that they cannot spend it, and the poor with too little money to buy the goods they produce.

THE "MARVELS" OF BIRTH CONTROL.

The argument of the advocates of Birth Control as a cure for poverty is two-fold. First, it is argued that if the birth-rate is reduced the expenditure of each family will be less and the family will be better off. If father had not got Maggie and Willy to consider, his £3 a week would extend to jam for tea for Thomas and Mary Jane. The

second argument is that if the population were smaller there would be no unemployed. Before considering the matter in detail, it is as well to notice that the second effect, if it takes place at all, cannot do so until 15 or more years have passed. Father is not replaced at his job by his son Thomas, aged 1, but may be replaced by him when he reaches the age of 15 or thereabouts.

But are either of the arguments correct? These advocates of Birth Control entirely overlook the way in which wages are fixed and the way in which unemployment is created. They forget that if the cost of living of working class families is decreased, no matter how, wages tend to fall correspondingly, so that a general reduction in the size of families would be wholly counteracted by a decline in the level of wages. If this is doubted it is only necessary to consider the way in which money wages rose between 1914 and 1920, and the speed with which they fell when prices declined. Civil Servants, railwaymen, local Government employees, and many others have had their wages directly related to the cost of living, but whether the reduction in wages takes place automatically or not, it invariably does take place for workers as a whole. They are unable to resist successfully the pressure which the employers can bring to bear.

If the average working class family becomes smaller, father and all the other fathers will find that their £3 has shrunk with the shrinking of their cost of living.

BIRTH CONTROL AND THE UNEMPLOYED.

We are told that if the population were smaller and there were no unemployed, the workers could keep their wages up in spite of their lowered cost of living. But unemployment is not the result merely of there being a large population. The organisation of industry and its private ownership are the important factors. The constant introduction of more efficient machinery and methods displaces workers from employment. It is much more direct, more important, and more speedy than anything which could be done by Birth Control.

The restriction of the population is of no practical use for the purpose of lessening unemployment. An illustration of this exists in the United States. After the War the U.S.A. Government introduced a policy of restricting immigration. But in spite of the limiting of the numbers of immigrants,

the introduction of labour-saving machinery has produced its millions of unemployed. Any attempt to raise wages immediately gives the employers an additional inducement to introduce such machinery. We see, therefore, that the standard of living of the workers is kept down by the joint effect of unemployed workers competing for jobs and of employers introducing labour-saving machinery. The restriction of the population, whether by birth control or any other means, is quite ineffective to safeguard the workers against this pressure.

THE POSITION IN FRANCE.

France, with a smaller population than this country, has a much larger number of workers withdrawn from production in some of the ways mentioned earlier in this article. Her army, navy, and gendarmerie number nearly 600,000. There were 1,500,000 Frenchmen killed in the war, and there are nearly another million disabled ex-service men capable of little in the way of productive work. In 1926 (the latest figures available) public assistance was given to more than 700,000 destitute persons. The number of aged poor registered for relief on 31st December, 1926, was 526,000. (See Statesman's Year Book, 1930.) The French Government's employees number about a million, which is much more than the number in the British Civil Service and local Government Service. A very large percentage of Civil Servants are, of course, engaged on non-productive work.

Actually, in spite of birth control, the total population of France is more than it was in 1911. In that year the population was 39,604,992; in 1928 it was estimated to be 41,020,000. (Statesman's Year Book, 1930. Pages 849/851). This is due partly to a lower death rate, partly to the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine from Germany, and partly to the influx of workers from abroad. If we exclude Alsace-Lorraine (population about 1,800,000) the population of France is now some 600,000 less than it was in 1911. On the other hand, it has been pointed out by the French economist, Francis Delaisi (*Daily Herald*, 17th January, 1930), that the number of workers in France has been added to by 1,300,000 men and women who, before the war, were small property owners, but are now compelled to work for their living. They have been squeezed out of the ranks of the small capitalists.

IS THERE UNEMPLOYMENT IN FRANCE?

It is true that at the present time the published figures of unemployment in France show only a few thousand, but it has to be remembered that the French Government does not keep records of unemployment for the whole of France. The published figures refer to Paris only. And it is a mistake to suppose that widespread unemployment is unknown in France. In March, 1921, there were 44,000 unemployed in Paris alone, while a year before the figure was 70,000. (See "Unemployment as an International Problem," by J. Morgan Rees, M.A., 1926, Page 83.)

Another factor is the employment of foreigners. Hundreds of thousands of the low paid workers in French agriculture and industry are by nationality Poles, Italians, or Belgians. As soon as unemployment threatens to become serious, these people are sent back to their respective countries. It may be said that during periods of industrial depression the French unemployed will be found lining up at Mussolini's Labour Exchanges.

ARE FRENCH WORKERS WELL OFF?

One important fact is often forgotten. It is that unemployment is not the only or even the chief cause of poverty. In every country in the capitalist world we find that the larger part of the workers are poor in comparison with the employing class, and a very large percentage of them are permanently unable to secure more than the bare necessities of life.

There are, of course, differences between the rates of pay in different occupations and differences between the levels of pay in different countries, but it is nevertheless true that inside each country there is this contrast between the position of the workers and the position of their employers.

The absence from France of millions of unemployed workers competing for jobs has not enabled those in work to secure any appreciable improvement in their low standard of living; the competition of the machine is more than sufficient for the employer's purpose. According to the International Labour Office the purchasing power of the French workers is about three-quarters of that of the German workers, and is only 58% of the purchasing power of the English workers. The comparisons made by the International Labour Office are not claimed to be absolutely complete, but they

do suffice to indicate what is approximately the relationship between the workers' position in the two countries. So low is the standard of living that only a couple of months ago the Postal, Telegraph, and Telephone staffs in Paris came out on strike in order to try to force their employer to raise their wages to the pre-war level. (For the benefit of those who advocate Nationalisation, it may be remarked that the employer in this case is the French Government.)

AN INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION.

France since the war has been going through what amounts to an industrial revolution. Before the war France was predominantly agricultural, and the land was to a large extent worked by peasant proprietors, producing for their own use and for the home market. Owing to the acquisition of coal and iron and industrial areas from Germany, and owing to various changes in world trade and industry, France has rapidly developed as an industrial nation. This has been accomplished by a chronic decline of agriculture. The French correspondent of the "Economist" said in January, 1929, that the agricultural depression was rapidly approaching a critical stage. It is estimated that the cost of producing wheat in France can be met with a yield of 8 quintals per acre, but the actual average yield is only 6 quintals per acre. The area under wheat in 1913 was 16,250,000 acres. In 1927 it had fallen to 12,750,000 acres, or more than 20%, and it is still falling. France is faced with a steady decline of agriculture, and the abandonment of once profitable farms. (*Economist*, January 12th, 1929.)

But while many farms have been abandoned, the full effect of the slump is not shown.

If the production of coal or hoots becomes unprofitable, the factory owner closes down and the workers become unemployed. But when a small farmer finds himself getting poorer, the final process of squeezing out may be deferred for years. He, and his family, work harder and longer, live on a lower scale, and postpone the final calamity while it is humanly possible.

"AN IMMENSE ECONOMIC CRISIS."

A special factor has operated since, and as a consequence of the war. Reparations payments received from the German Government have been used to make good the

enormous destruction wrought during the war, and to re-equip French industry. This has made work for French and foreign workers in France, and has meant a big sale for goods produced in various groups of French industries.

Now, however, that reconstruction work is finished, there is less demand for workers and less home demand for the products of French industries.

At the same time, the demand from abroad is also falling off.

In 1928 the French Government stabilised the currency on a gold basis. The way in which it was done had the result that for the time being the franc had a higher purchasing power inside France than outside. English or other foreign buyers could purchase more goods in France with 124 francs than they could buy abroad with £1, although £1 could be changed into 124 francs. In other words, French prices were below world prices. The consequence was that until French prices rose, or foreign prices fell, French manufacturers were able to sell abroad more cheaply than their foreign competitors. Factories were working full-time and unemployment was reduced to a low figure.

But now that condition is passing. At the end of 1927 the price level of French products (compared with 1914) was below the price level of products imported into France. By April of this year the price level of foreign imports had fallen well below the level of French products. French manufacturers are losing their temporary advantage. Exports from France during the first 6 months of the year were appreciably below the value and quantity of exports during the first 6 months of 1929.

French industries cannot in the long run escape from the conditions which apply to industries elsewhere. English textiles are depressed; so are textiles in France. British coal exporters complain of foreign competition. French coal interests protest against the increasing imports of cheap coal from Russia. Wine growers are being drowned financially in the enormous stocks of wine which they cannot sell. They are appealing to the Government to rescue them by increasing the soldier's free daily ration of wine.

The newly-appointed Minister for Finance states (*Economist*, July 5th) that "the country is faced with an immense economic crisis."

Sooner or later it will be evident that Birth Control in France is just as ineffective as a cure for unemployment as are all the other schemes for saving capitalism from the evils which it produces.

ANTI-WORKING CLASS BUSYBODIES.

In conclusion, some comment appears to be called for on the impertinence of the busybodies who advocate such remedies for economic ills.

There are human problems for which birth control may provide the solution, just as there are good reasons why some people should avoid alcohol, why others should spend more time in the open air, and why most of us should have more leisure and use it profitably. What, in fact, happens under capitalism is that many workers cannot afford to marry or to have children; they are driven to alcohol or some other stimulant owing to the fatiguing and depressing conditions of their work and their lives; they are worked too long and too hard and have not the money or the time to cultivate properly the occupations of people with more leisure.

We want the working class to resent this utterly unnecessary denial of opportunities for enjoyment and for making the most of their lives. The world is rich enough if the workers would but rid it of the out-of-date capitalist system. But we find our work for Socialism impeded by the muddle-headed enthusiasts who preach salvation through prohibition, birth control, industrial psychology, and what not. Nominally, they are actuated by pure sympathy for the workers, but invariably their remedies consist of ingenious methods of indirectly helping the employing class. The only reason they admit for doing anything or changing anything is to lower the employers' costs of production. Our natural desire for sexual intercourse and for children is to be limited so that the employers may get cheaper labour; we must not "waste" our money on alcohol because without it we should be more efficient workers; we must keep out of cinemas and spend our week-ends in the parks and playing fields, which our kindly employers or the state provide for us; if we do we shall be fine and fresh on Monday morning. We must work reduced hours; but only if the industrial psychologists can show that it will pay the boss, and only reduced just to that precise point at which it pays most.

We are to be born, educated, married, rationed in children and alcohol, our whole lives carefully supervised, and finally we may expect to be killed in war, all for the sake of the employing class, and all conducted under a smoke-screen of propaganda carried on by the birth controllers, the family endowment advocates, the prohibitionists, and all the other mischievous people who do not grasp or who deliberately obscure the simple outlines of the one great social problem.

H.

APPEAL FOR FUNDS.

It is no new thing for us to appeal to our readers for donations to assist us in carrying on our work. To those who know the Party it is sufficient to say that our need at the present moment is more pressing than it has been for some considerable time. Our larger Head Office costs us more in rent and other expenses, and we have during the past few years been hit by the decision of the L.C.C. forbidding the sale of literature and the taking up of collections in the parks and commons.

For the benefit of new readers, we would explain that our members are working men and women, and it is no easy matter for them to find the money required for carrying on the Party's propaganda, the money to print literature, hire halls, and so on. Our expenditure is kept to a minimum, and everything which can be done by the unpaid services of our members in their leisure hours is carried out in that way; the secretarial work, speaking at meetings, writing articles and pamphlets, and all the irksome tasks incidental to the work of the organisation.

Our readers cannot all help us directly by lending a hand in this way, but they can help by providing us with the funds without which even voluntary work cannot be carried on.

Please send your donations to the Treasurer at 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

WANTED!!

A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*?

Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months

PARLIAMENT OR SOVIET.

The *Proletarian* of America for July, 1930, publishes an article under the above title by John Keracher, which contains a covert attack on our principles and policy. Although our name is not mentioned, our Declaration of Principles is quoted.

The writer opposes our contention that the workers must capture power through parliament, but he carefully abstains from putting forward a course of action himself unless we are to take his blessing of the Paris Commune and the Russian Soviet as his idea of the future course of events.

The article contains alleged statements of Marx and Engels for which, significantly enough, no reference is given. Where, however, reference is given for quotations from Marx and Engels the context of these statements will not bear the interpretation Keracher tries to foist upon them. We will deal with these statements further on.

In a paragraph near the middle of the article Keracher ties himself in a knot and incidentally destroys his case. He writes:

Then, again, the election of working-class representatives to the parliamentary bodies (local and national), gives the proletariat an opportunity through those representatives, to combat the representatives of Capitalism at close range. Those elected representatives of the workers can take advantage of their prominent position to combat and expose the nature of capitalist legislation, and to speak to the proletariat over the heads, as it were, of their political opponents. To "elect its own representatives in place of the capitalists" is also a means of hampering the capitalists in their "exclusive political sway"; of contesting every measure they bring forth in their own interests, and proposing measures in Parliament that would be a decided advantage to the workers, even while fully realising that the capitalist representatives, in the majority, will not permit their passage.

Good! And when the working class has a majority in Parliament cannot they seize the State power? But Mr. Keracher is silent, wrapt in contemplation, with his gaze rivetted on Russia—which is thousands of miles away! Perhaps, in his simplicity, he thinks that when the working class have obtained a majority in Parliament the representatives should disperse to the constituencies and start forming soviets. They certainly cannot start these organisations with any success before—the "armed forces of the nation" will see to that!

In the effort to show the limitations of Parliament, Keracher, seeking for support from Marx, trots out the quotations we

have dealt with over and over again in these columns, and, like other opponents, he omits the significant context. According to Keracher Marx wrote: "The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." The paragraph in *The Paris Commune*, however, which is the opening paragraph of Chapter 3, runs as follows:—

On the dawn of the 18th of March, Paris rose to the thunderburst of "Vive la Commune!" What is the Commune—that sphinx so tantalising to the bourgeois mind?

"The Proletarians of Paris," said the Central Committee in its manifesto of the 18th of March, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of public affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious duty and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." But the working-class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

From the above it will be seen that the phrase referred to the position *after* the workers had seized governmental power. This is the point our opponents always appear to overlook. The workers must, first of all, obtain control of power; once they have obtained supremacy in the State then they will, as Marx follows on by explaining, re-organise the administration of affairs to meet their needs. In his introduction Engels also makes this position clear: "From the outset the Commune had to recognise that the working class, *having once attained supremacy in the State*, could not work with the old machinery of government." (Italics ours.)

Keracher, and others like him, are putting the cart before the horse. The quotation from Marx has no bearing upon parliamentary action in the way they seek to use it.

The comparison that is sought to be made between the Paris Commune and the Bolshevik Dictatorship is curious, as the Bolsheviks have done just the opposite to what was proposed by the Communards. The Communards proposed decentralisation whereas the Bolsheviks have established a rigid centralisation of control in the hands of a group inside the Russian Communist Party. The Communards made all posts elective and paid all officials the same pay as an ordinary workman. The Bolsheviks have established different grades of pay and

the central group appoints the officials. Yet Keracher says:—

It [the political form of the future] must be a Commune form, or Soviet form (the better-known term, since the Russian Revolution). The Soviet government is the fully developed Commune; or, as Joseph Stalin expresses it, the Commune was "the Soviet in embryo."

This Russian Soviet that is alleged to be the shadow of our future we have repeatedly shown to be a state wherein frantic efforts are being made to build up a capitalist industry. We have so often given evidence of this that one illustration must suffice here. In Russia there is a large and growing class of capitalist investors drawing incomes from private trading and from investments in the co-operatives and the Russian State Loans. In 1927, the total share and reserve capital in the Co-operatives amounted to ninety seven million pounds. In October, 1926, credits borrowed at home and abroad by the Co-operatives amounted to one hundred and eight million roubles. (*Soviet Union Year Book*, 1928, p. 183 and 193). State Loans in Russia are used exclusively for financing industry, and by February, 1930, had reached nearly 300 million pounds. (*Review of the Bank of Russian Trade*, May, 1930). The interest on these loans averages about 10%. What is the difference in essence between this and Western capitalism?

Is this a lopping-off of the worst features of the State—as the Commune did?

Keracher attempts to wave aside a paragraph in our Declaration of Principles on the ground that it is opposed to the phrase from Marx, relating to laying hold of the ready-made State machinery. After quoting the sixth paragraph in our Declaration of Principles he goes on to say:—

Marx and Engels, whenever they wrote in relation to the State, took pains to point out that this is just the thing that the working-class cannot do. The working-class cannot use "this machinery, including these forces," for working-class "emancipation and the overthrow of privilege." When writing on the Commune, Marx tells with approval of "the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people." In other words, it was not "this machinery, including these forces," that were to be wielded as an "agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege." The Parliamentary government was to be eliminated and replaced by the Commune form of government, with its "suppression of the standing army, and the substitution of the armed people." Marx eulogizes the Commune because it "got rid of the standing army and the police." These neo-

Marxians are going "to use the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation" (the capitalist parliament and the standing army, and police) as the "agent of emancipation."

If "Marx and Engels wherever they wrote in relation to the State, took pains to point out that this is just" what "the working class cannot do," it is surely strange that Keracher cannot produce a single quotation to support his view!

Instead he drags out one or two phrases which in their context have nothing to do with the point. We have already quoted the first paragraph from Chapter 3 of *The Paris Commune*. The following three paragraphs are devoted to a brief history of the growth of state power in France to the time of the Commune. Then comes the paragraph from which Keracher has torn pieces and fitted them to suit his argument. The paragraph runs as follows:—

Paris, the central seat of the old governmental power, and, at the same time, the social stronghold of the French working-class, had risen in arms against the attempt of Thiers and the Rurals to restore and perpetuate that old governmental power bequeathed to them by the Empire. Paris could resist only because, in consequence of the siege, it had got rid of the army and replaced it by a National Guard, the bulk of which consisted of working-men. This fact was now to be transformed into an institution. The first decree of the Commune, therefore, was the suppression of the standing army, and the substitution for it of the armed people.

It wasn't a case of eliminating "parliamentary government," but of resisting an attempt to restore an older form of government than the 3rd Empire. Also Marx was not referring to the general question of the suppression of the army, and his "eulogy" consisted of pointing out that as the army had been got rid of and was already replaced in the main by armed workers, the first decree of the Commune very properly as a natural consequence was the "suppression of the standing army and the substitution for it of the armed people." They took advantage of an accomplished fact.

In England and America, however, the army, etc., has not been got rid of, and the people are not armed. And in view of the rejection by Keracher of the conquest of the powers of government through parliament, we would be interested to learn from him how he proposes getting rid of the army and arming the people.

The misapplied phrase of Marx, however, does not touch our position. Marx said,

in effect, that you cannot carry on Socialism with capitalist governmental machinery; that you must transform the government of one class by another into the administration of social affairs; that between capitalist society and Socialist society lies a period of transformation during which one after another the political forms of to-day will disappear, but the worst features must be lopped off immediately the working class obtains supremacy in the State. This completely harmonises with the position laid down in our Declaration of Principles.

Mr. Keracher's peculiar group gives no indication of the way they propose getting rid of the armed force now controlled by the capitalist and they hide their lameness by a cloud of phrases, like the following:—

The Proletarian Party continually labours to organize the workers as a class, to perform a political act, namely, the conquest of political power by the vast majority, in the interest of the vast majority, and the organizing of a State form, such as the Commune of Paris and the Soviet of Russia, with its proletarian dictatorship to coerce and expropriate all expropriators, and to ultimately develop a classless society of free people.

This means, in fact, the organising of another state within the capitalist state.

And we suppose that while all this is going on the capitalists and the force they control, "are just going to stand, hat in hand, and say, 'Welcome, brothers. It's all yours!'" GILMAC.

CORRECTIONS.

In the Editorial in the July issue (column 2, page 168) a line which should have appeared as the eighth line from the top of the column was dropped so that it appeared as the third line in the paragraph below.

On page 167, line 12, the phrase "the natural source of supernatural phenomena" should have read "the natural source of supernatural seemings."

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

Arrangements have been made for the following three series of lectures to be given at Head Office during the winter months, commencing in October.

ECONOMICS.

HISTORY.

THE SOCIALIST VIEW ON CURRENT PROBLEMS.

One evening a week will be set aside for each of the three series. A further announcement will be made in due course.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this journal from Wholesale Agents: W. H. Smith & Son, Strand House, W.C.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

AUGUST,



1930

POLICE SPIES AND THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

On March 6th the American Communists organised a demonstration in Union Square, New York City. The police were ordered to clear the streets on the ground that the Communists had not obtained a permit for a parade. Five Communists leaders were arrested and the crowd were beaten up by the police with great brutality.

That, of course, is a common story. There is, however, an additional feature of some interest. The Police Commissioner, Mr. Grover Whalen, declared on the following day that he had his agents inside the Communist Party keeping him informed as to all their plans and the movements of their leaders. He was greatly amused because the uniformed police, in order not to give away the spies to the Communists, cracked their heads along with the others. Mr. Whalen has also supplied to employers the names of workers who are members of the Communist Party.

We refer to this because it illustrates once more the danger to the workers of organisations which advocate violence, and attempt to carry on illegal activities in the absurd belief that they can do so in secret. Illegal activities result invariably in some unfortunate workers falling into the hands of the

authorities and paying with imprisonment for the dangerous policies of their leaders. In this country during recent months there have been several heavy sentences on workers caught distributing inflammatory leaflets to soldiers. The Communist Party leads its unfortunate victims into trouble and can do nothing whatever to help them. Even if they succeeded in getting in touch with soldiers or sailors, it is almost certain that the latter would be discovered. It is exceedingly doubtful whether any of the so-called secret activities of the Communists are secret from the police. The only people who appear to be kept in the dark about the activities of their leaders, are the rank and file members of the Communist Parties.

A few years ago the American police were actually able to get one of their agents sent as a Communist Delegate, to represent the American Communists at a Congress in Moscow.

The only sound line for the socialist movement in countries such as Great Britain and the U.S.A. is to organise on a basis which makes secrecy unnecessary. This rules out the Communist policy of street fighting, but that policy is one which is of no use to the workers. On the contrary, it has, in many countries, often been engineered by the authorities themselves, through their inside agents.

EDINBURGH.

The Edinburgh Comrades are holding good meetings at the Mound several nights a week. A large part of the time is devoted to answering questions on Socialist policy, in view of the confusion spread here by the I.L.P. and Communist organisations, as well as direct action elements. The decline of Communists is seen in the poorly attended meetings conducted by them in this town, where once they had a large following.

Good sales of literature are being made, considering the uphill work of pushing scientific literature against the sensational and so-called practical rubbish which passes for working class education. All those interested in our work should attend our meetings.



Send your TINFOIL to the General Secretary at the Head Office—It will help to Raise Funds

LESSONS FROM TROTSKY'S LIFE STORY.**A DICTATOR DENOUNCES DICTATORSHIP.****THE GREAT MAN MOONSHINE.**

Few men have been more idolised in modern times than Leon Trotsky; and few men have been more bitterly attacked. The publication of his own life story should therefore arouse extraordinary attention but Trotsky nowadays has gone out of fashion. His universal Bolshevik worshippers have taken the cue from Moscow and dubbed him counter-revolutionist, and the world-wide Press invective against him has declined since he was pushed off the Russian political stage. Newspapers nowadays are only interested in him so far as he can be used in their anti-Russian abuse. Those who hold to the unscientific great man theory and who conceived Trotsky to be almost a god—or a devil, will be in a hopeless quandary to explain how such a "great man" was undone.

The situation in Russia, like any other stage in social evolution, cannot be explained by the rise or decline of this or that leading figure. The war and the resulting effects in Russia supplied the conditions which pushed into the forefront obscure figures like Trotsky, editing a paper in a back street in New York, and Lenin penning little-known articles in a remote Swiss town. Trotsky's incisive attack on the men who supplanted him is a complete answer to those who think that the great man makes the social situation instead of the social forces producing a human instrument limited and leavened by the conditions of his time.

That Lenin and Trotsky occupied so much space and claimed so much attention was not due to being "supermen" but was because backward social and economic Russia did not have the conditions under which many capable and experienced fighters could develop.

Trotsky's own life story is a large book of over 500 pages and is written in a very readable, graphic style that holds interest to the end. While the early part is devoted to his childhood and youth the chief part is written as a justification for his attitude in Russia against the Communist Party leadership. The personal element in the

book looms very large and most readers not acquainted with the interplay of men and forces in Russia will find it difficult to understand what were the actual differences between Trotsky and others in the Party. Trotsky's story is too full—of Trotsky!

THE CZARIST DAYS.

His stormy struggle in Czarist Russia is a good illustration of the hardships and penalties of an agitator's life when Church and Grand Duke held the fort. His early activity as a critic of Marxism and later as one of the members of the scattered Social Democratic Party in Russia is full of incident and interest, but space prevents it being referred to in detail here.

The secret meetings and secret organisation of Czarist days brought with it the agent provocateur or government spy, and thus Leon Trotsky, along with others, was arrested, and sent to Siberia. In prison he studied Marx's Capital, Kautsky's masterly reply to Bernstein and Plechanoff's able writings, etc. Escaping from Siberia he came to London (1902) and there for the first time met Lenin who was also in exile, and working on the "Iskra," a party paper smuggled into Russia. Trotsky, lecturing in the East End, was amazed at the stupid anti-Marxist arguments of men like Tchaikowsky, the Russian Liberal, and Tcherkesoff, the Russian Anarchist and war supporter. Trotsky also associated with Plechanoff and Vera Sassulitch at the early congresses of the Russian Party, and he indicates their varied ideas.

The attempted uprising, the general strike and ferment in Russia of 1905 took Trotsky back to Russia, where he met Krassin, the engineer, who was an active Bolshevik. The Party were then demanding a Constituent Assembly, the 8-hour day, better land distribution, etc. This was the period in which the St. Petersburg Soviet first achieved prominence, and in it Trotsky was very active.

The 1905 uprising was crushed by force, and Trotsky and the whole Soviet was arrested. Again in prison and transported to arctic Siberia, Trotsky once more escaped. Lenin fled to Finland.

IN EXILE.

Reaction sat heavy in Russia after 1905 and the activities of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks had to be carried on in Continental exile up to 1917. The Russian Social Democratic Congress in London in 1907, at Dalston, was a milestone in their history. The Executive were unable to find funds for the continuance of the Congress and after visits to Hyndman and others, it was, I think, Joseph Fels, the Single Tax Soap Manufacturer, who lent them £3,000 for the purpose. Rosa Luxembourg, Maxim Gorky and other famous people visited the Congress, which was so mysteriously referred to in the London papers of the time. The split over questions of centralized Party control had already taken place and thus the famous titles of Menshevik (Minority) and Bolshevik (Majority) came into use. These two names acquired, however, many meanings in later years, as each section chopped and changed their attitudes on various points.

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.

After the Congress, Trotsky went to the so-called International Conference at Stuttgart, where he met Adler, Kautsky, Hilferding, Bernstein and similar popular figures in Social Democracy.

He criticises their ideas about Russia but says nothing of the essential point that these men, along with the mass of the delegates and parties at these International Congresses, were anything but Socialist. Reform and opportunism was their road to power. Lenin, Trotsky and the other Russian delegates had no objections then, as they accepted the reform position of these parties and only took up general opposition over the war attitude when 1914 came. But long before 1914, in taking our stand, national and international, the Socialist Party of Great Britain had refused to be a party to the anti-Socialist reform and political trading policy of these parties at home and abroad who used the Social Democratic label. Whilst Lenin and Trotsky and the Mensheviks were in alliance with the parties and leaders who were later denounced as "betrayers," the Socialist Party had carried on the exposure for years, as the pages of our paper since 1904 show. Speaking of the Copenhagen International Congress (1910), Trotsky says: "After all, I was not yet sure of the sort of amendment that must be made to the entire

policy of the Social Democracy." He states that he found out in 1914.

THE WORLD WAR.

When Trotsky reaches the 1914 period he was living in Vienna and was shocked at the "Capitulation of the German Social Democracy." Had Trotsky overlooked their nationalism and ordinary liberal programme so similar to the general run of self-styled Socialist Parties—who all lined up for the World Carnage? Trotsky avoided internment by going to Switzerland which was to become the home of Lenin and most of the other Russian exiles during the War. Trotsky says Lenin thought the newspapers had faked the reports that German Social Democracy had voted for the War, for "Lenin's faith in the German Social Democracy was still as strong as that." (Page 204.) Trotsky met Karl Radek, in Switzerland, who differed from Trotsky's view that a proletarian revolution would result from the War. Radek held that the productive forces were not sufficiently developed. This attitude surprised Trotsky.

After a brief stay in France, during which the Zimmerwald Anti-War Conference in Switzerland was arranged, Trotsky was ordered out of France and went to Spain, where the kindly hand of the French foreign office followed him and had him deported. He chose New York as his next haven, and here, after a brief sojourn of two months on the Russian paper, *Novy Mir* (New World), the news came of the fall of Czarism.

After Trotsky left for Russia and was detained in Canada by Lloyd George's influence, a legend about him grew up in U.S.A. and amazing imaginary stories were told. Even Frank Harris, in *Pearson's Magazine*, had to get a story afoot and so he treated us to a romantic tale of how he had met Trotsky in New York and explained to him what must be done in Russia. Such is journalism.

Trotsky met Bucharin in New York, where we knew him as a member of the Left Wing Propaganda Group, whose shining light was Louis Fraina, the apostle of Force, who was accused by the Soviet Envoy of being a spy. In passing, I may add that Fraina was appointed the International Secretary of the Communist Party of America, and put on the Executive at Moscow.

Bucharin was then friendly to Trotsky,

as neither was in power. The woman who was afterwards to become Soviet Minister of Welfare—Alexandra Kollontay—was also in New York. Trotsky complains that nothing was revolutionary enough for her—she took an ultra left stand against Trotsky and Lenin, we are told. This attitude towards Madame Kollontay indicates Trotsky's judgment, as Madame Kollontay was the only Russian propagandist we heard in America who opposed the reform and opportunism so current there and who publicly stated that the Socialist Party of Great Britain took up the correct position. She, however, later incurred the displeasure of the Moscow machine and was transferred to Mexico in the diplomatic service.

RUSSIA UNDER THE REPUBLIC.

Trotsky arrived at Petrograd in May, 1917, and his story of the overthrow of the Provisional Government of Democratic Liberals and Mensheviks is told at some length, but a far clearer and fuller picture of the events is given in John Reed's "Ten Days that Shook the World"—reviewed in these pages many years ago. The turning point in favour of the Bolsheviks was that the soldiers and sailors, sick of war and want, came over to their side. The Lenin-Trotsky element had won the majority in the Soviet by adopting their opponent's—the Social Revolutionary Party's—peasant platform.

Trotsky was sent to Brest-Litovsk as Commissar for Foreign Affairs and with Lenin's consent signed the peace treaty with Germany. The harsh terms were accepted, Trotsky tells us in his "Peace Program," because without the hourly-expected World Revolution, Russia was not in a position to fight over terms. When Chicherin, Petroff, Litvinoff and other Russians were released from English prisons and went to Russia in 1913 the Bolsheviks were able to re-arrange official positions and Trotsky was persuaded by Lenin to become War Minister. Trotsky knew nothing of military affairs. He says (300): "Was I prepared to do military work? Of course not. I had not even had the benefit of service in the Czar's army." Yet Maxim Gorky and many others write as though Trotsky made the Red Army. The peace released crowds of trained Russian officers who had to live and were ready to serve the new Government. There was the trained rank and file coming home from

the War and when Germany surrendered later to the Allies, German officers were obtained for use in the building of Russia's army.

THE PEACE TERMS.

Stalin has resurrected every difference that Trotsky had with Lenin over points of policy in order to charge Trotsky with being an anti-Leninist. The conflict of ideas about accepting peace terms between Lenin and others has been used by Stalin although Trotsky finally accepted Lenin's point of view. But when the Bolsheviks were faced with crushing terms by Germany, Lenin said at first, "Yes, we shall have to fight, though we have nothing to fight with." (P. 332.) A few minutes later Lenin changed his mind and said that military action would be ruinous.

When French and English diplomats brought an offer from their Governments to assist the Bolsheviks to continue war against Germany, Lenin and Trotsky were favourable; Bucharin objected to an alliance with the Imperialists. The Central Committee of the Party—which held the reins of Government, supported Lenin and Trotsky. Trotsky quotes Lenin's resolution from memory: "That Comrade Trotsky be authorized to accept the assistance of the brigands of French Imperialism against the German brigands." (P. 333).

Russia, however, was in no position then to fight over conditions, so the peace terms were signed.

WAR COMMUNISM.

The rest of the story of the Russian struggle has been often told. Trotsky recounts his personal part in it. The efforts to impose "War Communism" with the resulting collapse due to a hostile peasantry and backward industry; the conscription of labour with military discipline in the endeavour to stop the decline, and the free and easy manner of working; these and similar policies were tried in vain. "The working masses were more and more disinclined to submit to the ways of military rule." (P. 397.) Trotsky argued that the trade unions must be made organs of the State, as there was no place for them under War Communism. Lenin took an opposite view.

MARX'S LESSON.

The teaching of Marx, the materialist explanation of history was now brought

home to the actors in the Russian drama.

The stage reached in material development determines the social system possible in a country. Laws and edicts cannot dodge the obstacles that stand in the way of the normal development of a country. Communism could not be carried out where the productive powers and methods belonged to the early stages of capitalism. Peasant Property dominated Russia. The ideas of the population arising from these conditions were not Socialist. Socialist ideas could only be bred from highly-developed conditions of production where associated labour and large-scale industry had prepared the mind for social change.

So the new Economic Policy of free trade in commodities was ushered in to save Russia. It is still the basis of economic life in Russia. The Premier of Soviet Russia, Rykov, admitted this in his official speech to the Moscow Soviet on March 9th, 1928:—

All the talk to the effect that we are abolishing the New Economic Policy and introducing a system of requisitioning and the like is nothing but counter-revolutionary twaddle, which must be energetically opposed. The New Economic Policy underlies our entire economy and will remain so for a long historical period. The New Economic Policy permits of traffic in goods and the sufferance of Capitalism on condition that the State retains the right and the possibility of regulating trade from the standpoint of proletarian dictatorship ("International Press Correspondence," 29th March, 1928).

The admission that capitalism cannot be avoided in the evolution of Russia, proves the idiocy of those who hold up Russia as the Socialist example. Rykov's reference to the State is misleading.

The material conditions of production are the determining factor and the State had to adopt the New Economic Policy because it could not avoid the economic obstacles in its path. No matter who wields the State power they cannot successfully legislate in conflict with the ideas flowing from the backward economic condition of a country. Peasant property made hash of all the Dictator's decrees. Thus was the materialist conception of history proved true in Russia and the lesson Marx taught made plain.

Political parties, even dictatorships, cannot impose systems at their will; the method of production is the real dictator deciding what can be done.

AFTER LENIN.

Trotsky traces Stalin's opposition to him back to the days when Stalin was removed from positions by Trotsky's orders as Minister of War. Trotsky's long absence out in the country in charge of the Red Army gave Stalin an opportunity, according to Trotsky, to prejudice others against him and to curry favour with Lenin, who was fast becoming an invalid and nearly paralysed. The death of Lenin in January, 1924, was followed by Trotsky's long illness. Very soon after recovery he was relieved of his post as War Minister, although Stalin says he was dismissed.

Lenin's death coincided with growing opposition inside the Party to the rising influence of the Kulak or rich peasant. One "workers' opposition," led by Madame Kollontay, had long since been silenced but others took its place. Lenin's wife was opposed to the party policy. She held that "Nep" was capitalism, but Stalin in one place says that such an idea is "absurd." (Stalin's Leninism, p. 435.)

TROTSKY'S POSITION.

Trotsky held that Socialism could not come in one country alone, particularly Russia. The policy of the party, therefore, he claimed, should not be to work in harmony with the rich peasants and the Nepman but to promote the World Revolution. He objected to the growing bureaucracy in the party—he demanded more democracy—now that the "machine" was being used by others.

Stalin was secretary of the party and had built up an anti-Trotsky bloc or caucus. All the early writings and especially Trotsky's story of 1905 and the October (1917) Revolt were used to fasten on him the title of anti-Leninist and liquidator of the Revolution. Trotsky attacked the Third International's policy in Germany during the 1923 upsurge and also their attitude in backing the Nationalist Kuomintang in China with such terrible results for the thousands of "Communist" victims. Stalin and Co. backed the General Council during the General Strike here in 1926 and thought that Purcell and Co. were with the workers. Trotsky demanded a break with the General Council and denounced Stalin and Co. as opportunists. He demanded the publication of Lenin's last testament. This has never been done.

At the great Tenth Anniversary Demon-

stration in Moscow in 1927, the opposition carried their own banners inscribed with such demands as, "Let us Carry out Lenin's Will," "Against Bureaucracy," etc.

EXILE AGAIN.

Soon afterwards, at the 15th Congress of the Party, the entire opposition was expelled and given over to the charge of the Bolshevik secret police, the OGPU. Trotsky was taken to distant Turkestan and there, on the borders of China, carried on correspondence and kept in touch with his supporters. He was ordered to give up political activity under the penalty of being deported and, refusing, he was put out of Soviet territory and is now trying to persuade each country in turn to give him a home.

Zinoviev, the overlord of the Third International, and Karl Radek were busily occupied denouncing Trotsky, but they, along with Bucharin, Tomsy, Rakofsky, Kameneff, Krassin, Preobashevsky, etc., very soon took up the work of opposing Stalinism—and so right or left wings of the Party were formed. The very arguments of Trotsky became theirs and practically all of them from Rykov the Premier to Karl Radek were either expelled from their positions or membership, or made to recant. Zinoviev joined with Trotsky but gave in at the last moment only to be once again accused.

Thus many of the leading Bolshevik figures were silenced. Only one political party is allowed to exist in Russia and every attempt at propaganda on the part of the opposition was crushed. Their press was confiscated and the heavy hand of the Military Tribunal descended upon those who sought to win support by speech or writing. So the Machine won.

WHAT IS THE LESSON?

After narrating Trotsky's story in outline it is necessary to draw attention to the lesson of the whole series of events. Neither Trotsky, nor Stalin (in the lengthy book written against the former) attempts to do so. In fact none of the many writers explain the cause of that long internal party struggle in Russia or its relation to Russian economic and political life. Trotsky merely attacks Stalin as though it is simply an individual matter.

The prominent Bolsheviks, who have so bitterly denounced the bureaucracy of

present-day Russia and demanded wider democracy, have each and every one of them been to the fore in upholding terrorism and dictatorship. Whether in attacking Kautsky or in defending Bolshevik ideas they have gloried in smashing "democratic methods." Trotsky's "Defence of Terrorism" was the handbook of Bolshevism, and Karl Radek's "Proletarian Dictatorship and Terrorism" was the most outspoken message of minority rule the Communists issued.

Now, however, that they are suffering from their own methods being applied they bitterly complain.

The explanation of the policy pursued in Russia is in the economic situation there in 1917 and in the equally backward outlook of the population. Eighty-five per cent. were peasants, and in the towns industry was in a very undeveloped condition. Socialism, therefore, was not possible. Thus conditions paved the way for power to be seized by the Bolshevik minority (Communist Party). Stalin tells us that Lenin's position was this:—

240,000 members of the Communist Party will certainly be able to govern the country in the interests of the poor and against the wealthy, seeing that they are in no way less competent than the 130,000 landowners who in former days governed the country in the interests of the wealthy and against the poor. (Leninism, p. 298.)

The Bolsheviks therefore, even according to Lenin's comparison, could only rule a country of 150 millions in the way the previous minority ruled them—by ignoring democratic methods and imposing their policy upon the majority. Capitalism and feudalism have a ruling class composed of a minority. A minority party can rule Russia but Socialism and even the building of a Socialist mass movement demands democratic methods.

A minority Bolshevik party kept power in Russia by yielding to the economic necessities of the country and by adopting a policy, therefore, to pacify the peasant. Hence arose the contradiction between their Socialist claims and statutes, and the actual capitalism they were building up. Socialism being impossible in Russia to-day, they had to develop Russia's resources by going through a capitalist form of society. Stalin tells us that "the new economic policy permits of a free market, of capitalism, of wage labour." (Leninism, p. 429.)

The work of spreading Bolshevik ideas

could be carried on it is true. But in spite of living through the many years' rule of Bolshevism, out of 54 million adults among the peasantry, the number of members of the Communist Party is 136,000, or 0.37 of the adult rural population. (Stalin's Leninism, p. 298.)

The apostles of minority rule and the supporters of Dictatorship were faced then and are still faced with the question, who shall be the dictators? Once democracy is pushed aside and the masses do not have an open, free and full opportunity of coming to a decision; with all the information before them; with the chance of assembling and discussing; with the power to read and hear the various points; when these things are absent those concerned in a movement are simply the material upon which conspiracies and underhand methods can thrive. So in Russia the Bolshevik policy of Dictatorship has bred the inevitable contest for the dictators' positions.

Those who are acquainted with Communist Party organisation can well understand the part that "caucuses," "blocs" and similar machine methods played in the internal struggle in Russia where each follows a leader and strongly assails his opponents.

The lesson to be gathered from Trotsky's story, therefore, is the one taught by Socialists. That Socialism includes democracy and it can only be established when the majority understand it and decide to establish it. It cannot be imposed upon them by minorities, be they led by Trotsky, Stalin, Tomskey, Lenin, or some other leader.

Russia under Stalin or anybody else at present is compelled by necessity to carry on capitalism because it is not ripe for Socialism.

A. KOHN.

"THE SOCIALIST."

It will not be news to our readers that "prosperity" in the U.S.A. has taken a wrong turning. We regret to have to announce that something has happened much more serious than the ruin of large numbers of gamblers on the New York Stock Exchange. The issue of "The Socialist" has had to be suspended temporarily. The following extract from a letter written by our New York comrades tells its own story:—

Conditions here are much worse than you

read in the papers. More than half our members are unemployed; others had to leave for other parts, crippling us almost mortally. At open-air meetings, where formerly we sold from 12 to 14 dollars' worth of literature in an evening, we now do well to sell one and a-half dollars' worth. The workers simply cannot afford to buy.

This is bad news, but not quite so bad as it might have been. "The Socialist" will not disappear. It will be printed, but at intervals which will be irregular for a time until conditions improve.

Readers in Great Britain who have paid their subscriptions through the S.P.G.B. will be supplied with the number of issues for which they have paid, unless we hear from them to the effect that they wish the unexpired part of the subscription returned.

THE FORCES MAKING FOR SOCIALISM.

In the June issue, we dealt with Shaw's reference to Marx's "dream" of International Socialism. We pointed out that "the very development of capitalism makes Socialism inevitable." A Manchester correspondent says that our statement is incorrect.

In the original short paragraph we could not explain the full meaning of such a phrase. It has been explained in this journal often, but we will outline the basis of our position.

The economic development of the present economic system produces industrial efficiency and at the same time growing economic insecurity and unemployment. The concentration of wealth into the hands of relatively fewer owners increases the contrast between the workers and the employers. The anarchy of each firm producing as much as possible for the same market leads to continuous over-production under the highly organised producing system of to-day.

Contradictions such as increasing productive power along with increasing misery more and more affect the workers' minds. When they escape from the confusing ideas of the reformers the workers will organise to take over the industries, etc., and end the discord between social production and private ownership. The working class will rescue society from the chaos which would ensue unless the fruits of industrial evolution were gathered up into a new system, consistent with economic tendencies.

Does our correspondent deny the inevitability of Socialism? If not, what makes Socialism inevitable but just the economic developments of the present system? The same development will drive more and more workers to seek a way out and, therefore, make them willing listeners to the propaganda of Socialism, until under the varying pressure of conditions the mass of the workers are compelled to accept the Socialist policy and organise to win political power to establish the new system.

Economic conditions, it is true, do not alone change class rule. The contest for supremacy is a struggle between classes. But the development of economic conditions drives the subject class to struggle to establish a new system.

The development of capitalism makes Socialism inevitable, because while the material conditions are ripening, the working class are being matured for their emancipation.

C.

NOTES BY THE WAY.

LASKI'S ERROR.

Professor Harold Laski, writing in the current number of the *Political Quarterly*, refers to the "well-known" view of Marx and his followers that capitalism can only be overthrown by violent means.

This may be well-known to Professor Laski, but it is unknown to us, and was unknown to Marx. It is a pity that Professor Laski does not give the evidence for his extraordinary statement. When, about three years ago, his book on "Communism" was reviewed in these columns, attention was drawn to other mistaken views about Marx which are held by Laski, but although a copy was sent to him and acknowledged, he did not attempt to defend his statements. He continues to repeat them, still without evidence.

* * *

THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY GETS FURTHER AWAY FROM SOCIALISM.

About a year ago the American Socialist Party, in its endeavour to become more popular, dropped from its constitution the mention of the class-struggle. It is now considering the advisability of dropping the word Socialist from its title and calling itself the "Independent Labour Party." We are sure that all Socialists,

both here and in the U.S.A., will be quite enthusiastic about the idea. The American Socialist Party was never in any respect Socialist, and the proposed change of title would clear the way for our colleagues of the American Socialist Education Society to form a real Socialist Party.

* * *

THE S.L.P. IN TROUBLE.

The Australian S.L.P. has broken with and been repudiated by the parent body in America. The Australians claim that "the American S.L.P. has weakened from the Principles, Policies and Tactics advocated by Daniel De Leon."

The trouble appears to have arisen largely out of the insertion in the American *Weekly People* of advertisements of books containing matter contrary to the S.L.P. position.

The whole controversy, as described in the Australian *Revolutionary Socialist* is, however, so clouded under a stream of personal abuse that it is a little difficult to tell what really is the matter. Anyhow, they are annoyed, and describe Peterson, of the American S.L.P. as a "demented being," the associate of "assassins," "slanderers," "larceny-mongers," "thieves," and "thugs."

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Owing to pressure on our space several answers to correspondents have been crowded out of this issue.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.	
Sunday ...	Clapham Common, 6 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. ○ Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 7.30 p.m.
Tuesday ...	Southwark, Trinity Street, 8 p.m.
Wednesday ...	Stepney Green, 8 p.m. Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 8 p.m.
Friday ...	Battersea, Beechmore Road, 8.15 p.m.
Saturday ...	Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

EDINBURGH.	
Wednesdays ...	The Mound, 8 p.m.
Fridays ...	
Saturdays ...	
Sundays ...	The Mound, 7 p.m.

GLASGOW DISTRICT.	
Sundays ...	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.
Thursdays ...	Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA**.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE**.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM**.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CENTRAL**.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- EAST LONDON**.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW**.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.1.
- HACKNEY**.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communicat on to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.
- HULL**.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month at 213 Beverly Road. Communications to M. V. Coupland at above address.
- ISLINGTON**.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.
- LEYTON**.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER**.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month at 8.15 p.m., at 183 Oxford Road, All Saints.
- PADDINGTON**.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).
- SHEFFIELD**.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA**.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- SOUTHWARK**.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- TOOTING**.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.
- TOTTENHAM**.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW**.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD**.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.
- WEST HAM**.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec. F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N. 8. Branch meets 2nd 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m. at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS— That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 313. Vol. 27.]

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1930.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

RUSSIA: LAND OF HIGH PROFITS.

("The Soviet Union Year-Book, 1930." Publishers: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 7s. 6d.)

The Soviet Union Year-Book, compiled and edited by A. A. Santalov and Louis Segal, Ph.D., M.A., is published "to provide business and public men with reliable information on the economic and political life of the U.S.S.R." It contains in its 670 pages accurate and detailed information from official sources on all the chief aspects of Russian economic and political life. For business men seeking trade connections, and for those who wish to combat the double campaign of misrepresentation which is carried on by the ignorant and prejudiced in the ranks of capitalist parties on the one hand and in ranks of the communist party on the other it is an indispensable work of reference.

It is not possible here to describe fully the range which is covered. It must suffice to indicate some of the facts and figures which will be useful to the Socialist student of Soviet affairs.

PRODUCTION AND FOREIGN TRADE.

Much space is devoted to the growth in trade and production. Agricultural production in 1928-29 was 4 per cent. above that in 1913, and in 1932-33 it is planned to reach 59 per cent. above the 1913 level (page 92). Industrial production in 1928-29 was 73 per cent. above the 1913 level, and in 1931-32 will reach 166 per cent. above that level (page 94).

Exports in 1928-29 were valued at 877 million roubles, as compared with 1,520 million in 1913. Imports in 1928-29 were valued at 836 million roubles, as compared with 1,374 million in 1913 (page 289). It is planned to increase exports to over 2,000 million roubles in 1932-33, and imports to

over 1,705 million. In 1909-13 agricultural exports represented 70 per cent. of the total exports, and industrial exports 30 per cent. In 1932-33 the proportions will be equal, if the plan matures (page 291).

HIGH RATES OF INTEREST AND PROFIT.

The Concession Companies make staggering profits out of the exploitation of the Russian workers. In 1926-27 the average profit was 81 per cent. on the capital invested by them.

In 1927-28 it was 96 per cent. (see page 208). What a harsh reality after the dreams of the visionaries for whom Russia was to serve as a model to the Western world. One of the Bolshevik slogans of 1917 was, "Down with the foreign bondholders." They were duly "downed" and the National Debt repudiated. The Soviet Government has just repeated its willingness to resume part of the old National Debt obligations, but in the meantime the foreign bondholders have given place to "home" bondholders—a distinction without a difference from the standpoint of the Russian workers.

A rapidly increasing percentage of the total revenue of the Government is raised by means of additions to the new National Debt. In 1927-28 the percentage was 0.5; in 1928-29 it was 8.6 per cent., and in 1929-30 it will be 11.5 per cent. (page 397).

On October 1st, 1925, the new National Debt stood at 367 million roubles (about £36 million). On October 1st, 1929, it was 2,595 million roubles (£259 million) (see page 398). It is at the present moment nearly 3,000 million (£300 million), and it is planned to increase it to £500 or £600 million in the next year or two.

The amount raised by means of loans during the one year 1929-30 reached the total of 1,335 million roubles (page 391).

In the same year the Government spent 450 million roubles on payments to the new investing class who have invested their money in Russian industry through the Russian Central Government. Interest rates are very high; up to 12 per cent.

Other avenues of investment for Russia's propertied class are the co-operatives. Hundreds of millions of roubles are invested in that way (see pages 226 and 621).

All of these forms of investment, in the National Debt, in the co-operatives, and in the trading concerns, etc., are forms of exploitation of the Russian workers. They, like the workers everywhere, carry on their backs a class of property owners, receiving incomes from property ownership.

The very high rate of interest which rules in Russia owing to the slowness with which foreign investors enter the Russian money market, may serve to explain why the Russian Government, or certain influential groups behind it, continues without any tangible result to finance Communist parties abroad. Investors inside Russia would naturally not want the interest rates to fall from 10 per cent. or 12 per cent. to 4 per cent. or 5 per cent., and an obvious method of preventing this would be to play upon the fears of foreign Governments and investors, and thus save themselves from unwelcome competitors.

EXCESS PROFITS TAX.

As in this country, the income tax in Russia is a graduated one, there being five categories. In each of them provision is made for different rates of tax on ranges of income from under 1,000 roubles a year up to 24,000 roubles and over (page 402).

The fifth grade applies to those whose incomes are derived from "ownership of industrial and trading enterprises, from money investments, dividends on shares, etc." (page 402), also incomes from "rent" (page 401).

Then, in addition to the income tax, there is an excess profits tax for those companies whose yearly profits exceed a standard which is described as the "normal profits" (page 405).

It is this economic organisation, possessing all the usual features of exploitation (rent, interest, and profit, a working class, and a property owning class, a stock exchange, etc.), which the Community parties describe as "Socialism"!

WAGES AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

The average money wages in 1928-29 was 892 roubles (£89, or about 34s. 6d. a week) (page 453).

The worker's output is increasing at a greater rate than his wages. Under the five-year plan the "productivity of labour" in the end of the five-year period will be "doubled and real wages are to show an increase of 70 per cent" (p. 97).

(Information about the inequalities of wages and salaries was given in THE SOCIALIST STANDARD for December, 1929.)

The number of unemployed in 1924-25 was 848,000; in 1926-27, 1,353,000; and on January 1st, 1930, 1,310,000 (page 454).

The amount paid out in unemployment insurance in 1928-29 was 111,500,000 roubles. This works out at about 80 to 90 roubles a year for each unemployed person (on the basis of 1,300,000 unemployed). This, in English coinage, is about £8 10s. a year, or 3s. 3d. a week. The trade unions also pay unemployment benefit to their members from 3 to 18 roubles a month, say from 1s. 6d. to 9s. a week. Although the unemployed are exempt from the obligation to pay rent, or charges for lighting, water and transport, it would seem that they do not have a very pleasant time. Is this what our communists have in mind when they ask the Government here to give the unemployed "full maintenance"?

INHERITANCE.

As in other capitalist countries inheritance of property is recognised in Russia. "Soviet law recognises the right of inheritance, irrespective of the amount involved" (page 498).

As in this country, it is subject to an inheritance tax (page 405). The tax rises from 5 per cent. on the first 2,000 roubles (£200) up to 90 per cent. on that part between 200,000 and 500,000 roubles (£20,000 to £50,000).

THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

The membership of the Communist Party on July 1st, 1929, was 1,554,012, which represented 184 in every 10,000 of the adult population, or 1 in 54 (page 565).

The number of new members enrolled in 5½ years from 1924 to June, 1929, was 1,408,742. The number expelled in the same period were 128,460.

On July 1st, 1929, the party was compared as follows:—

Workers, 724,115; peasants, 200,452; employees, etc., 629,327. Women form 13.5 per cent. of the whole membership (page 566).

EDUCATION.

In December, 1926 (the last available figures) illiterates had been reduced considerably, but still represented 433 per 1,000 of the whole population (page 462).

The expenditure on education by the Central Government is under 3 per cent. of its total expenditure (page 462).

It is less than the amount spent on the army and navy (page 389).

HOPES AND FACTS.

In the first section of the "Constitution of the U.S.S.R.," passed in 1923, Russia is depicted in the following rosy terms:—

"Here—in the camp of Socialism—are mutual confidence and peace, national freedom and equality, and dwelling together in peace and the brotherly collaboration of peoples" (see page 1).

The facts given in this Year-Book sufficiently illustrate how illusory the communist dreams have been. Like many pious hopes embodied in the official documents and constitutions of the rest of the capitalist world these phrases have no relation whatever to the actual facts. Russian capitalism, although administered by the Communist Party dictatorship, reproduces almost down to the last detail the paraphernalia of the capitalist world as we know it here.

The lesson of it is the one we have tried to drive home for so many years, that it is not possible for a minority to impose Socialism upon a majority who are hostile or indifferent; nor is it possible to remedy backward economic development by means of fine-sounding but ineffective decrees, issued by dictators.

H.

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

Commencing the first week in October, the following classes will be held at Head Office:

HISTORY. Monday evenings, 8 p.m.

ECONOMICS. Wednesday evenings, 8 p.m.

CURRENT PROBLEMS. Thursday evenings, 8 p.m. (commencing Thursday, 9th October).

The classes are free and open to all. At the classes on History and Current Problems, each lecture will be complete in itself, and inability to attend regularly need not prevent students from attending when they are able.

THE GREAT LIE.

We still speak familiarly of the War, as though it were something that only occurred the other day. It is curious to reflect that our boys of sixteen were babies in arms, and our young men now coming of age were toddling infants when red ruin was let loose on an unsuspecting world. Each year it is customary on the anniversary of the catastrophe, for the tawdry minds of Fleet Street to reassure a doubtful world that the slaughter was not in vain. Its hideous futility and long-drawn-out horror, are concealed in flatulent phrases about our National Honour, our concern for International Rights, the Sacredness of our Pledged Word, our Regard for the Rights of Small Nations, and other eyewash. Should there be any who still allow these illusions to drift about their consciousness, they might do much worse than spend half-a-crown on Mr. Ponsonby's "Falsehood in Wartime." August 4th this year again fell on Bank Holiday, exactly as it did sixteen years ago, and it seemed fitting to celebrate the anniversary by reading how our Christian rulers lied the people into massacre, lied them through it, and lied them back to peace and unemployment again. As Mr. Ponsonby says: "There must have been more deliberate lying in the world from 1914 to 1918 than in any other period of the world's history." Those who were too young for the shambles last time, would do well to examine the bait that caught their fathers and their elder brothers. The collection is not exhaustive. It is only an exposure of a few samples, and is intended as a warning. The nation was assured that it was not committed to France in any way. It was a lie. "All preparations, down to the last detail, had been made, as shown by the prompt, secret and well-organised despatch of the Expeditionary Force." The German invasion of Belgium was given as the cause of Great Britain's entry into the war. It was a lie. Mr. Ponsonby gives the evidence. Germany, of course, we know was solely responsible for the war! Mr. Asquith said so: "One Power, and one Power only, and that Power is Germany." Lloyd George referred to it as the "most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations. . . ." (August 4th, 1917.) Three years later the Welsh Wizard realized "that no one at the head of affairs

quite meant war at that stage (August 1st, 1914) . . . and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it." Four years of the bloodiest horror the human race has experienced, "and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it." What a thought for Bank Holiday. If the twenty million dead could only read that.

And then there was the notorious lie of the passage of hordes of Russian troops through Great Britain, en route for France. In less than a month the atrocity stories commenced. There was the nurse whose breast had been mutilated, the Belgian baby whose hands had been hacked off, the Canadian who was crucified, the tale of the prisoner whose tongue had been torn out, the tattooed man, and so on. All lies, utter downright lies. Everyone remembers the German corpse factory yarn. Who believes it now? And so we go on. Lists of atrocities that never happened, photographs that were faked, official documents that were doctored; lies by the cubic ton, lies by the square mile, lies by the great gross, and all to secure the killing of men and the starving of women and children. The British established a truth manipulating factory at Crewe House, under the appropriate leadership of Lord Northcliffe, founder of the "Daily Mail." He'd had some experience.

Mr. Ponsonby is candid. He says in his introduction: "This is no plea that lies should not be used in war-time, but a demonstration of how lies *must* be used in war-time. If the truth were told from the outset, there would be no reason, and no will to war."

He calls attention to the new and far more efficient instrument of propaganda which has appeared since the last war—the Government control of broadcasting. He concludes: "None of the heroes prepared for suffering and sacrifice, none of the common herd ready for service and obedience, will be inclined to listen to the call of their country once they discover the polluted sources from whence that call proceeds and recognise the monstrous finger of falsehood which beckons them to the battlefield."

We agree. We were saying that ten years before the war. It is important to realise, however, that the pollution is not confined to war-time.

W. T. H.

PADDINGTON TO THE FORE.

Paddington is a borough of contrasts and paradoxes where social extremes can be seen rather more sharply defined than in many places. Monuments of pomp and power range themselves alongside of squalor and filth, and the insolence of wealth jostles disease and penury in the streets. The sooty air and polluted canals, the dingy piles of dwellings, the belching chimneys and the endless rushing to and fro of the melancholy "hands" would serve as the scene of some imagined Hades. Here devoutness goes hand in hand with hypocrisy and charity with brutality. It is the class conflict operating within the social system. The unemployed and the employed, harassed and ill-fed, alike can look forward to nothing better than an old age in which their lives become still more limited.

This is the black outlook of Paddington's wage-earners.

The Paddington Branch of the S.P.G.B. has opened a campaign of propaganda to tell these too-patient fellow victims of capitalism that there is no earthly or heavenly remedy for their social ills except in Socialism, search the universe where they will.

We invite those who wish to learn more about Socialism to come to the meetings advertised elsewhere in this issue. We invite sympathisers to consider joining the branch and giving us their assistance in spreading our message. We are already having good results, and with more help we shall better them.

BEN CARTHURS.

EAST LONDON.

A Series of Meetings

will be held at

Bancroft Library Hall,

Bancroft Road, Mile End, E.,

Each THURSDAY, commencing on

Thursday, 2nd October, at 8 p.m.

(Doors open at 7.30 p.m.).

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

Admission Free.

All Invited.

All those interested are asked to watch for local announcements.

"CAPITAL" GOING ABROAD.

A reader asks us to explain what is meant by the statement that capital is leaving the country. Does it mean "gold and copper coins, or war-bonds or factories and machinery, or what?"

The cry, "Capital is leaving the country," is intended to signify that capital is being withdrawn from industry here and sent abroad. Capital is money invested for the purpose of profit, and it is invested by the buying of shares in a company. If a capitalist wishes to withdraw his capital from an undertaking he must sell his shares to realise their value. As he must sell his shares to another capitalist, which is all he can do, then capital has not been withdrawn. The only change that has taken place is one capitalist has been replaced by another in a given industry. As shares are constantly changing from one hand to another capitalists are constantly changing from one industry to another, or the amounts of capital they have invested varies in different industries at different times. At one time a given capitalist might own twenty shares in an oil company and ten in a soap company; at another time he might own ten in the oil company and twenty in the soap company.

To grasp the matter clearly it is only necessary to ask oneself the following question: If the bulk of the capitalists in this country decided to withdraw their capital, or, what comes to the same thing, sell their shares for cash, to whom would they sell them? It will then be seen how absurd is the claim that the capital which is sent abroad is being *withdrawn* from industry.

Capital, however, does go abroad, and it also comes from abroad. Briefly the position is as follows, leaving technicalities out.

The exports of a country are paid for by the imports either in goods only or in goods and services. For instance if the total exports of a country amount to £1,000, then payment is made by an import of the equivalent value of goods only or of goods and services. In the days when England was the carrying nation of the world, payment for services rendered to foreign merchants by carrying their goods was accomplished by the import into England of goods to the value of these services. When ordinary merchandise imported or exported is not sufficient to balance accounts between

nations then the balance against one or the other nation has to be made up by the export of gold.

If a capitalist in England has accumulated dividends to such an extent above his spending power that he has a large balance at the bank and decides he will invest a portion of it in a company in Brazil, then he must proceed in one of the following principal ways:

(1) Buy gold and have it transported to Brazil.

(2) Buy merchandise and send it out to be sold in Brazil to realise the amount of his proposed investment.

(3) Pay a Brazilian debt in England and have the amount credited to him in Brazil.

(4) Get a bank to arrange the matter. This they would do by the mutual cancellation of debts or mutual exchange of capital between England and Brazil, or, the same thing at bottom, by a roundabout exchange or cancellation through other countries.

Each and all of these methods involves at bottom the mutual exchange of goods or goods and services. Fundamentally it is the exchange of the work of the working class of one country for the work of the working class of another, as far as the principal countries of the world are concerned. So that all that happens is, for instance, some Brazilian exploiters draw some of their unearned incomes from England and some English exploiters draw some of their unearned incomes from Brazil.

The answer to the question, therefore, is that when capital goes out of the country capital comes in; capital goes out in the form of goods and services and capital comes in in the form of goods and services in exchange for what has gone out. It being understood, of course, that it is only when goods are sold and the money realised is invested in an enterprise with the object of deriving profit from it that such money has become capital. It is not the thing, money, but the use it is put to that makes it capital, for capital is only one way of using money, and money is only the name applied to gold or representatives of gold used in a certain way. GILMAC.

SOUTHEND.

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS.

Sunday, 14th September, 11.30 and 5.30.
(Opposite Kursaal.)

NOTES BY THE WAY.

ARE THE LABOUR VOTERS SOCIALISTS?

Dr. A. Salter, Labour M.P., stated in an article in the *Daily Herald* (May 2nd), that not 10 per cent. of the electors are Socialist. He said:—

Labour candidates polled only 36 per cent. of the total votes at the last election, and of that 36 per cent. how many were those of convinced Socialists? I wish I could believe that 10 per cent. of the people of this country desire the establishment of a Socialist Commonwealth!

Dr. Salter correctly concludes that in face of this the Government has no mandate to introduce Socialism. But in that case, why are they in office, and why is Dr. Salter in Parliament?

A LABOUR PARADISE.

Bermondsey has long had a Labour majority on the Council. The uselessness of the Labour Party's policy of reforming capitalism is well illustrated by the following facts about Bermondsey, submitted in evidence to the Licensing Commission by Dr. Salter, M.P.:—

"One in seven of its residents is in receipt of Poor Law Relief. The population is homogeneous in the sense that there are no social strata as in most townships. The middle classes have long since removed from the district, and, owing to obvious residential disadvantages, a steady efflux has been going on for years of all those who could afford to remove to a more open and more desirable neighbourhood. Clerks and artisans have gone, and to-day the people left are almost wholly belonging to the unskilled and casual waterside labour classes. The middle class element is represented only by a small handful of clergy and doctors. There is no resident solicitor or barrister, no civil engineer, architect, or accountant. Most of the non-conformist ministers live outside the borough, and there is no cab-rank or bookshop."

"Wages are very low, and the average figure for regularly employed adult male workers is well under £3 a week. At the end of 1928 and beginning of 1929 I made an investigation into the wages of 860 successive male panel patients, seen by me with regard to wage rates. I found that the average wage of those in regular employment amounted to £2 16s. 4d. per week."

"Parts of the borough are very densely covered with a network of small, closely-packed streets and alleyways, while in other districts there are acres of high block dwellings of five or six stories, where the density of the population amounts to between 400 and 500 per acre."

RAILWAYMEN'S LEADERS WIN A "VICTORY" IN THE IRISH FREE STATE.

The officials of the National Union of Railwaymen have won a great "victory," having obtained recognition from the Irish Omnibus Co. As is usual in such cases what the members have gained is not obvious.

The Great Southern Railway recently bought out the road transport companies which were robbing them of their best paying traffic. They promptly celebrated that move by attacking the wages and conditions of the workers in their road transport concern, the Irish Omnibus Company. The men struck work in April and succeeded eventually in getting the railwaymen to come to their assistance.

The N.U.R. officials had resisted a strike movement among their Irish Free State railway members, but were compelled to recognise the railway strike after it had begun. They then threatened a general strike for Tuesday, July 22nd.

A meeting took place—in secret—between the two companies and the N.U.R. leaders. It was followed by Mr. Cramp's announcement of a great victory. The terms were that the railway strike was called off, all railway strikers were reinstated, and the N.U.R. was granted official recognition by the Irish Omnibus Co. No guarantee was given for the immediate or ultimate reinstatement of all the 'bus company strikers, and nothing is said about the wage and other questions which led to the 'bus strike in the first instance.

As we have often pointed out, the only safeguard against this kind of thing is that the workers on strike should keep the negotiations under their own control, and not entrust them to leaders to conduct in secret with power to accept whatever terms they think fit.

It need hardly be added that the Irish Free State Government, the Government for which misguided Irish workers fought,

helped the employers just as the British Government used to do before the Irish Free State became "free."

ST. THOMAS THE MARTYR!

What the Labour Government has done for the Unemployed.

Mr. J. H. Thomas, addressing the Conference of the National Union of Railwaymen, in July, 1929, said:—

I have been entrusted with the responsibility of seeing how far within the limits of our Parliamentary traditions and our resources of the State—and accepting the present order of society—how far it is possible to mobilise, organise, institute, and get going useful works for those now unemployed. ("Daily Herald," 6th July.—Italics ours.)

Three months later Mr. Thomas had done nothing, but had gained more confidence. In a speech at the Labour Party Conference at Brighton, on Tuesday, October 1st, he told the delegates:—

I am confident that when February comes our figures will be better than the figures of the late Government ("Daily Herald," 2nd October.)

When February came the figures had gone not down but up—by hundreds of thousands, which drew from his defender, Mr. John S. Clarke, M.P. (who used to worship De Leon, then Lenin, then MacDonald), the explanation that Thomas really knew all the time that unemployment would not fall, he knew that the

world depression . . . was bound to increase before it showed signs of lifting; that there was and is no permanent cure for unemployment under a system of private control. ("Forward," 31st May, 1930.)

Mr. Thomas, it appears, was really a noble fellow, "suffering a distressing martyrdom without complaint," and lying for the sake of you and me. Anyway, Mr. Thomas' luck was out, and in due course he transferred his £5,000 a year martyrdom to another Cabinet ministership. Now the number of unemployed on the register is over 2,000,000, which is the highest figure since the national coal strike in 1921, and represents an increase of 900,000 during the period of the office of the Labour Government.

DEAN INGE STUDIES SOCIALISM.

Not long ago, Dean Inge was presented with a copy of our pamphlet, "Socialism and Religion." We see that he has been profiting by it. In the course of a lecture at the Wesleyan Methodist Conference at

Leeds on July 18th, he spoke about Socialism and Religion and put very plainly the fundamental antagonism between them. He rejected the possibility of Christ having been a Socialist, and the claim that Socialism is based upon New Testament teaching. Speaking of Christ, he said:—(*Manchester Guardian*, July 19th).

It is hardly necessary to say that even if He had wished to lay down a scheme of Socialism, and such an idea never occurred to Him, the conditions of Palestine under Pontius Pilate and Herod would have put it out of the question. His travelling missionaries were to live on alms like begging friars, but this proves nothing. His own little band seems to have carried a bag with money in it, and to have bought food when they needed it. Christ was a prophet, not a legislator.

Some people reject Christianity because they do not understand it; others because they do understand it. To the latter class unquestionably belong the disciples of Karl Marx, for what excites their passionate hatred of Christianity is precisely that idealistic standard of values which cuts the ground from under the feet of their savage and vindictive materialism. If Christ is right, Marx is utterly wrong.

Except that materialists are almost always less savage and vindictive than idealists, this is just what we point out in our pamphlet. We are, however, startled by Dean Inge's association of Rousseau and Marx, and by his statement that had there been no Rousseau there would perhaps have been no Marx and no Socialist doctrine.

Dean Inge goes on to repeat a statement he has often made, and which, in spite of being challenged, he does not attempt to prove. That is his assertion that communist-administered capitalism in Russia is the result of applying Marxian theories. It is one of the privileges of being a Dean that statements which are sound sense and statements which are clotted nonsense are alike accepted without question by nine people out of ten. This is bad for the nine people, and has a most demoralising effect on Deans. P. R.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

"Memories of Lenin." G. N. Kruskaya. Martin Lawrence. 5s.
"Soviet Union Yearbook 1930." George, Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.
"Cromwell and Communism." Edward Bernstein. George, Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

FINSBURY PARK.

Meetings will be held in Finsbury Park each Sunday at 4.30 p.m.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free... .. 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

SEPT.,



1930

LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S SOLUTION.**UNEMPLOYED TO EMIGRATE.**

When the MacDonald Cabinet came into office the Countess of Warwick, who presumably knows what level of intelligence meets the needs of the members of her class, proudly claimed for her political friends, the Labour Ministers, that they are the "party of brains." Far be it from us to dispute her claim. Still less would we deny that they are industrious seekers after knowledge. Have they not during one short year appointed nearly 40 Royal Commissions and Committees of inquiry? Are there not hundreds of members of these committees closely cross-questioning other hundreds of expert witnesses and reading millions and millions of words of evidence? And has not the Premier appointed a very special Economic Advisory Council, composed to a large extent of prominent Liberal and Tory economists and captains of industry? With this great machinery pouring out facts and opinions is it possible that our rulers will miss even a single small grain of useful knowledge? The answer, we regret to say, is that they are not likely to learn anything whatsoever which will prove beneficial to the working class.

The general result of these inquiries could be foretold in advance. The terms of reference of the Commissions and Committees and their composition preclude the barest possibility of a Socialist policy being recommended. Does the anti-Socialist professorial muddler of economic theory abandon his prejudices when he secures appointment to the Economic Advisory Council? Does the company director come there to devise ways and means of abolishing the capitalist system which gives him his power and privilege? Or, are the Liberal Party leaders, with whom the Government is holding private discussions about unemployment, likely to do so.

And if a miracle could take place, and if the capitalist thistle of a committee of inquiry did produce a fig in the shape of a recommendation in favour of Socialism, what would the Labour Government do with it?

What could they do? Elected by the votes of non-Socialists, a minority at that, they must do what their predecessors did—run the capitalist system as best they may and fob off the discontented electors with one excuse after another as long as they can. The expedient of setting up Commissions of Inquiry in order to postpone the awkward admission of failure to carry out Election promises is a time-honoured device of Governments. It is also the rankest dishonesty. When the Labour Government has supplemented its own knowledge with the false theories of all the economists, all the business experts, all the intellectuals, and all the politicians in all the capitalist parties, the truth will still remain that capitalism can only be run on capitalist lines, and will continue to produce poverty, unemployment and insecurity for the workers.

Unemployment is a problem which well illustrates the ignorance and trickery of the Labour Party. The Party in its literature and in the speeches and writings of its leaders has at different times adopted and proclaimed as their own unfailing remedy every nostrum of their Liberal and Tory opponents. For a time we were told that "high wages" in America had solved the unemployment problem, but Mr. William Green, the President of the American Federation of Labor, told the Senate Commerce Committee in April last that for 2½ years the unemployment among the Federation's members had never been less than

9 per cent. Last winter it rose to 22 per cent.—one in five out of work! Other Labour leaders told us that agricultural co-operation on Danish lines was the cure; but Denmark has unemployment as severe as our own. They pointed to Rationalisation as the painful operation necessary in order that work might be found for all; yet Germany, that much rationalised nation, has this year had 3 million men and women vainly seeking employment. The Labour leaders were also parties to that most colossal of post-war frauds, the greater production campaign, but now their spokesmen admit that the world is being stifled with over-production. They have preached shorter hours, but Mr. Snowden has just told the industrial employees of the Government that they must wait until times are "more favourable." These and many other useless or harmful schemes have been handed out by the Labour leaders to a credulous electorate. Then last year they tried a dose of J. H. Thomas at £5,000 a year, but the unemployment figures promptly leapt up to more than two millions. Now finally, they are reverting to the old and exploded scheme of migrating the unemployed to other Empire countries.

We recall how the Labour Party cried to heaven when Tories and Liberals told the unemployed to get out of the country and look for work elsewhere. Mr. Tom Shaw, at present Minister for War, was suitably ironical eighteen months ago concerning the "ecstasies" of the Imperialists "about the development of distant parts of the Empire." . . . (Article in the "Morning Post," 18th February, 1929.) The last Conservative Government set up a transfer board to move unemployed miners to imaginary areas where jobs were vacant. How the Labour Party scoffed at the idea of solving unemployment by moving the unemployed from one depressed area to another!

But now the Labour Government, according to the "Daily Herald" of 12th August, is considering a big Empire settlement plan by which the unemployed will be employed on development schemes in the Dominions. Mr. George Lansbury says that he feels "positive that there are tens of thousands of young men in this country who, if they were certain of a proper chance of a decent and self-respecting livelihood in the Dominions, would jump at it." Mr. Lansbury, who is himself in receipt of £2,000 a year

for his post in the Government, explained a day or two earlier, that he thought it a most terrible tragedy that these young men "should be able for years of their growing lives to live on a sort of public allowance." ("Daily Herald," 11th August.) It is pertinent to remind Mr. Lansbury that his "sort of public allowance" was given to him because he was going to assist Mr. J. H. Thomas to solve the unemployment problem. His and Thomas's expensive labours produced nothing, and there are nearly a million more unemployed. The young men are out-of-work because Mr. Lansbury and the Labour Government have utterly failed to find them the promised jobs. But Mr. Lansbury, the £2,000-a-year failure, deplores that they should be getting paltry unemployment pay. His alternative is that they should be found work in the Dominions. The "Daily Herald," on the following day, unkindly sent this new-old fraudulent remedy into the rubbish heap with the others, by informing us that Australia has its own unemployment of "alarming proportions." "Thirteen per cent. of trade unionists are now out of work, in addition to thousands who do not belong to any unions. Those who know, estimate that there are at least 150,000 unemployed." ("Daily Herald," 13th August.) The correspondent of the "Daily Herald," writing from Australia, added that "there is strong opinion that the stimulation of migration far exceeding the nation's power of absorption is the principal cause of the present unemployment problem. With the stoppage of this flow of emigrants a return to normal conditions is confidently expected."

And after Australia, Canada! Two days subsequent to Mr. Lansbury's optimistic views on emigration to the Dominions the "Daily Herald's" correspondent in Canada announced that a bar had been put up against assisted immigrants owing to the heavy unemployment. Canada only wants immigrants with some capital. ("Daily Herald," 15th August.)

So Mr. Lansbury and the Labour Government have nothing else to offer to the unemployed than to ship them off to the Dominions, in spite of the fact that the Canadian Government and the Australian Labour Government are faced with alarming and continuous unemployment of their own, and firmly declare their determination not to receive Great Britain's surplus workers.

The Labour Government has no policy except to try to administer capitalism in a way which they hoped would be better than administration of capitalism by Liberals and Tories. In many respects they have actually made the position worse. So little do they know of economic theories and the workings of the capitalist system, so bereft are they of any constructive ideas, that they can do nothing but desperately tread once more the pathways worn by their predecessors in office, pathways which lead to disillusionment for the workers.

This is what happens when a "party of brains" takes on the task of patching up the capitalist system. When the working class wake up to the realities of the situation they will apply their intelligence to a different task, the institution of Socialism. They will seek to understand their own problems instead of elevating the MacDonalds, Thomases and Lansburys into positions of power from which to broadcast pitiful nonsense copied from the programmes of the other parties of capitalism.

TO OUR READERS. PLEASE NOTE!

The "Socialist Standard" can be obtained from the following Newsagents—

Coombs & Fancourt, 548, Barking Road, Plaistow.
A. E. Cohen, 297, Barking Road, East Ham.
H. Williams, 36, Barking Road, Canning Town.
C. W. Honess, 63, Stratford Road, Plaistow.
H. S. Bailey, 42, Tower Bridge Road, S.E.
A. Dennington, 518, Romford Road, Manor Park.
Brewster, 155, Barking Road.
W. Villiers, 139, Lower Road, Rotherhithe, S.E.
A. E. Compton, 93, Commercial Rd., Peckham, S.E.
H. Moorcroft, 136, Plaistow Road, West Ham.
C. Clarke, 70, Bramley Road, N. Kensington, W.
T. R. Baker, 85, Trinity Street, Canning Town.
Clifton, 153, Blackfriars Road, S.E.
D. A. McLean, 17, Union Street, Belfast.
W. Pryer, 25 St. Leonards Street, Bromley-by-Bow.
A. C. Gray, 7, Abbey Street, Bermondsey, S.E.
D. Milner, 120, Beverley Road, Hull.
S. Parks, Drypool Green, Hull.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this Journal from W. H. Smith & Son, Strand House, W.C.

WANTED!! A NEW READER.

Do you know a likely friend who does not read the *Socialist Standard*?

Send us his name and address and a Postal Order for 6d., and we will forward a copy for 3 months

THE CASE FOR SPIRITUALISM.

Battersea, S.W.11.

To the Editor.

Dear Sir,

Being interested in political economy and a reader of long standing of the S.S., I am tempted to ascertain your views of the following:—

For many years past I have held no brief for any religion, but having heard a lot about spiritualism and also read your criticism on same, decided to test it myself.

I told nobody where I was going, and I went into a meeting a perfect stranger to all. To my surprise I was told of my dead aunt, her manners when alive, how she died, her age, and her name; after which I was told I was suffering from a complaint which I had attended hospital for. The said complaint is very uncommon, and is not visible to anyone except when nude.

Sir, the above is only one of many experiences I have witnessed during my visits to these said places; therefore I consider it calls for an explanation to many who, like myself, desire to know and seek the truth.

I must say that not one word or hint was given by me, in any manner at all to assist these people.

Sir, realizing the value of space in the S.S. relating to things of political importance, and, therefore, placing my inquiry second, I should like to have a reply through any channel you may desire.

I am, One in the struggle,

CURIOUS.

REPLY.

Our correspondent's experience and the conclusions he draws from it are common ones among those who have been attracted to Spiritualism. In order to test it let us put the problem in its simplest form.

This reader went to a spiritualist meeting and was told several things about himself which he and others already knew.

That in itself he would not regard as startling except for his belief that he was "a perfect stranger" to those present, and that the things he was told were not known to them.

Now may we ask our correspondent if he really has good ground to believe that nobody present knew anything whatever about him. We, of course, know no more than is told in the letter, but it will be readily agreed that it is by no means difficult for people whom we do not know by sight to have or to get information which in such circumstances may sound impressive.

The ability of certain persons to get hold of facts about him does not in any way whatever help to establish the belief in the existence of so-called "spirit forces."

ED. COMM.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS.

To the Editor of the SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Is it, or is it not, correct to hold that Marx used the term "Capital" in the sense of "Money," seeing that all commodities are only "Money" circulating in a different way?

That the "Price of Production" (of commodities) is not "determined" by the "quantity of labour embodied in them," but is ultimately "determined" by monopoly?

An adherent of the S.P.G.B. informed me that a lecturer on economics at headquarters seriously discussed the question as to whether a "cart-horse" is "constant" or "variable" capital. If this is a fact (?) then I feel bound to remark that the lecturer must be considered a "doctrinaire," and in no way propagating "Socialism in Our Time."

I trust you will favour me with a reply, because it is important to clear up such current conceptions—or "misconceptions."

I remain, Yours faithfully,

ROBERT CHAPMAN.

Walworth.

The replies to the points raised are given below.

(1) This matter is dealt with in "Capital," Volume I, page 123 (Sonnenschein Edition), in the following passage:—

As a matter of history, capital as opposed to landed property, invariably takes the form at first of money; it appears as moneyed wealth, as the capital of the merchant and of the usurer. But we have no need to refer to the origin of capital in order to discover that the first form of appearance of capital is money. We can see it daily under our very eyes. All new capital, to commence with, comes on the stage, that is, on the market, whether of commodities, labour, or money, even in our days, in the shape of money that by a definite process has to be transformed into capital.

(2) The "Price of Production" is the cost price plus the average profit. This is, of course, affected if the manufacturer has to buy raw materials from sellers who have a monopoly, and on the other hand the manufacturer's selling price will be affected if he has a monopoly. In other words, the theory of value in its simple form assumes competition. Monopoly (which in practice is, however, only an interference with competition, not a complete suspension of it) modifies the simple theory. Nevertheless, the labour theory of value is still the underlying explanation, even in a world where monopoly is strong.

It must not be forgotten that there are many forces at work tending to undermine monopoly. This subject is dealt with in "Capital," Volume III, pages 186, 209 and 1003 (Kerr Edition).

(3) Your point here appears to be that a lecturer should keep to main issues, and not devote attention to minor academic points. Once granted, however, that it is worth while studying economics, the lecturer cannot avoid dealing with such points if raised by a student. To the student a clear view of such points may often be necessary in order that he may understand the general theory.

ED. COMM.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT.

S. GILBERT. Your long letter referring to the article "Parliament or Soviet" rests upon a supposed quotation from the "Gotha Programme." As, however, the article contains no such quotation, we fail to see what is the point of your letter.

THE PAY OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

A LETTER FROM A READER.

Forest Gate.

Dear Sir,

As a regular reader of the *Socialist Standard* I should like to take exception to the article appearing a month or two ago on "Nationalisation," in which the low wages of various Governmental employees were quoted.

As a Socialist, I am aware of the defects of Nationalisation, but would like to point out that though some employees of the Government do very badly, some do very well.

Under the term Government I include the Local Councils of Boroughs, etc.

In the first instance we have policemen receiving, after 10 years' service, £4 10s. wages, plus 15/6 rent aid, for a constable; sergeants, inspectors, etc., get more; much more in the cases of the higher ranks.

Firemen, I believe, receive the same wages, less the rent aid, as it is termed.

Teachers in the Elementary Schools appear to do very well when compared with industrial workers.

Lady Teachers commence, I believe, with £3 per week, and get somewhere about £5 a week after a few years, as one instance.

School Attendance Officers as the school board man of our school days is known, start at about £4 16s., and rise to £5 5s.

Also we have Local Government Board Officers as the clerks employed by Municipal Councils term themselves, with others, such as sanitary inspectors, etc., receiving in many cases anything from £4 10s. to £7 or £8 per week, coupled with three or four weeks' holiday.

Most of the above have no more training than a skilled mechanic is required to have, and in many cases they have considerably less, but compare the wages and conditions and they are vastly different, as you already know.

I hope I am not taking up too much of your

valuable space, but I am afraid I could not state my case in less words.

In conclusion, I wish the S.P.G.B. and the *Standard* the best of luck in the future, and hope you will receive this letter in the spirit of helpful criticism that is intended by myself, as full facts are and must continue to be the essential feature of the S.S.

Best wishes from

"SOCIALIST."

REPLY.

Our correspondent misses the point of the article he criticises. The contention made in that article was that there is "little difference from the workers' point of view, between State capitalism and private capitalism, whether under a Conservative or a Labour Government."

To say, as our correspondent does, that an elementary teacher is paid more than an industrial worker, has nothing whatever to do with the question discussed. He must compare like with like; for example, compare the pay of industrial workers in the Government service with the pay of industrial workers outside. If he does he will find that our contention is correct.

But the whole question is easily settled by the statements of Civil Service authorities themselves. The Civil Service Industrial Court which fixes the pay of civil servants has laid it down when dealing with lower grade civil servants that

the broad principle which should be followed in determining the rates of wages of Post Office servants, is that of the maintenance of a fair relativity as between their wages and those in outside industries as a whole.

The Industrial Court takes into account the civil servant pension rights and any other benefits he may receive, and fixes his cash wage accordingly.

But whereas the Civil Service bases the pay of *lower grades* on the rates of pay in comparable occupations outside, the *higher grades* in the Civil Service are definitely paid *less* than the rates of pay in comparable occupations outside. This has long been a complaint of the grades concerned. In evidence given at the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (now sitting). Sir Evelyn Murray, Secretary of the Post Office, was asked if the Post Office pay as much in their higher grades as is paid outside, and replied:—

I do not think that is a principle that the Government have ever accepted as regards the higher grades of the service. (See Minutes of Evidence. Question 4618.—Ed. Com.)

POINTS FOR PROPAGANDISTS.

OVER-PRODUCTION AND WANT.

The followers of Malthus and the Secularists who still talk of over-population are completely refuted by the universal facts of modern industry. The command of man over nature in producing a food supply has increased so rapidly that there is a widespread demand to limit production.

Agriculture lagged behind industry so long in increased production that whilst industrial products declined in price, the products of agriculture tended to rise. The application of machinery to farming and the adoption of large scale methods on the land has now reached such a pitch and so lowered prices that the agriculturist is crying out. Prominent owners express their joy that the crop in South America is poor this year. Such is the pass to which production for sale and profit has brought us.

The *Sunday Express* (June 29th) tells us that 2 million acres of wheat and maize land will go out of cultivation next season and that Brazilians are burning coffee because they cannot sell. The meat combines of S. America have been practising restriction of production, we are told by the same paper. They also inform us that in spite of "real efforts" to restrict the production of petroleum in U.S.A. it increased there by 14 million metric tons. The total world increase this year, compared to last, is 23 million metric tons. The Shell Oil Co., however, is not in bankruptcy, but was able to report a profit balance of 6 million pounds and pay 25% dividend this year.

Economic development proceeds alongside the efforts to limit production, as the recent advances in the oil refineries show. The *News of the World* (June 29th) reports that a new process for doubling the yield of motor spirit from crude oil by the use of hydrogen is being developed. The German Chemical Trust and the Standard Oil Co., and the Royal Dutch Co. jointly control the process, in order to control output and extract all possible profits by gently but firmly killing that noble spirit of competition which used to be praised as "the life of trade."

The increase of productive power along with the vast increase of wealth which cannot find a market has led the author of "The Case for Capitalism"—Mr. Hartley

Withers, to make the following confession:

This spectacle of universal plenty along with universal distress, is very far from creditable to the alleged enlightenment and civilisation which we are now supposed to enjoy. People who have worked for us have worked so well that they cannot make a living, and yet we are none of us getting nearly as much benefit as we should out of the consequent cheapness of things ("Sunday Dispatch," 6th June).

Let society own the tools and produce for use!

* * *

IS SOCIALISM A RELIGION?

There is a conventional assumption that Socialism is opposed to religion. The assumption comes from orthodox camps on both sides. With all the being born of 40 years of active Socialist life I would like to shake it as a terrier proverbially shakes a rat.

The angry author of these words is Mrs. Bruce Glasier, in the I.L.P. paper, the *New Leader* (June 13th). She shows the "harmony" between Socialism and Religion by robbing Religion of its accepted meaning, and defining it as "the spirit of the whole." Karl Marx and Lenin are both religious types, according to her.

She does not attempt to show that Socialism is in accord with religion, as commonly and correctly understood. She leaves completely alone the conflict between the materialist basis of Socialism and the superstitions and supernatural character of religion. The community spirit is common alike to religion and Socialism, Mrs. Glasier informs us.

Socialism, however, is the object of a militant movement recognising the class struggle in modern society. The Socialist realises also that religion as we know it, is an instrument of the ruling class to divert attention from the real world and the real work to be done.

This I.L.P. pioneer has a conception of religion as confused as her idea of Socialism—"the economics of the Lord's Prayer." Why not the Sociology of Baptism?

* * *

CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES AND THE I.L.P.

The I.L.P. state on the front page of the *New Leader* (June 27th) that employers will not be able to deduct children's allowances from wages, as they will be paid like pensions through the Post Office. Such childish simplicity and evasion may suit these

reformers. It is not necessary for the employers to inquire if their workers are getting children's allowances, but the general receipt of such payments will act as a basis for compiling the average family cost of living. In a fiercely competitive labour market there will be little difficulty in employers making the workers accept the revised wages. Lord MacMillan, in making his report on woollen wage reductions, pointed out that social services such as pensions, insurance, etc., should be taken into consideration in fixing present-day wages. It has been a regular policy for years to engage pensioned men who can live on less wages.

Children's allowance experience in Australia give the lie to the I.L.P.

In another issue (July 11th) the *New Leader* tells us that during strikes the children's allowances will assist the workers to win, as the children will no longer go hungry on account of the strike. Such is simple faith. During recent strikes it has been noted how difficult it has been for the strikers to get poor law relief for the children. During the General Strike (1926) the Press stated that plans were being made to attack the bank accounts of the Trade Unions to prevent strike pay being issued. And if children's allowances were passed by a capitalist government they would control its administration and these allowances could be suspended when it suited the governing body if the interests of the employers were at stake.

It is not surprising that such a body of misleaders as the I.L.P. should have their discussions of party policy in private as they announce to take place at their Summer School at Welwyn (*New Leader*, July 11th). More secret diplomacy!

* * *

HOW GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP WORKS.

The one big union of Canada has sent a representative to the Privy Council here to appeal against the decision of the Government-owned railway of Canada—The Canadian National. This national railway has adopted a policy pushed by the American Federation of Labor, known as the B. & O. Plan, called so because it was first initiated by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in the U.S.A. It has led to the pro-

motion of many safe and servile company unions there.

The masters needed a scheme to kill any militant union activity and also to increase output while silencing workers' complaints. The B. & O. Plan is a brand of efficiency systems which pretends to make for profit sharing and fosters "co-operation" between master and man. A pliable tool was found in the American Federation of Labor Unions, which was given special privileges to enlist membership and to smooth the path for the adoption of the masters' plans. The one big union complain that the American Union has been given sole recognition, with the result that either dismissal or joining the American Federation has been forced on the men.

Speeding-up and spying on each other, which is the common feature of co-partnership systems, has become the rule. The O.B.U. complain that J. H. Thomas is at the head of the "forceful" union they are fighting. They are applying to the Privy Council for the right of assembly and freedom to join a union of their choice.

So much for Government ownership or nationalisation, the aim of Labour Parties. The one big union has to face the fact that business, nationally or privately owned, is carried on for profit, and concentration of industry collectively in investors' hands—called national ownership—simply provides a more powerful force against the workers.

The municipalising or nationalising ideas of many of the workers in Canadian Unions has been given a nasty blow, which should make them see the need for political action for Socialism.

A. K.

Sunday Evening Meetings.

AT
42, Great Dover Street, S.E. 1.

(Near Borough Station, Underground.)

Date.	Subject.	Speaker.
September 7th	E. Hardy.
'Why Socialists Oppose Family Allowances.'		
September 14th	W. McHaffie.
"The State and Revolution."		
September 21st	J. Uttin.
"What Means this Emancipation?"		
September 28th	A. Beales.
"The Economics of Rationalisation."		
All invited.		Admission Free.
Questions and Discussion.		Commence at 8 p.m.

A SOCIALIST SEARCHLIGHT

NO MORE CLASS WAR.

During the last twenty-five years, he said, thousands of rich people had come to see that the best thing they could do in life was to share in the great task of improving conditions of the community.

The time, he believed, was not far distant when rich and poor would co-operate in serving the community.

No, it was not Mr. Churchill who said that, but Mr. George Lansbury, at Rotherham ("Daily Herald," July 21st).

This First Commissioner of Works, and Christian Evangelist, visited Russia a few years ago, and in his book, "What I Saw in Russia," grew lyrical over "the achievements of Russia," compared with the miserable efforts of Capitalism at home.

Although the rich have been helping the poor so much here, there are faint rumours that for many years past the employers have been busy reducing wages and smashing strikes. The kind-hearted employers who are going to co-operate with the poor, are still very active in keeping a system going which produces poverty for the worker and profits for the idler. What better evidence do you want than Lansbury's speech, to prove how the Labour Party serve Capitalism? Don't struggle, but love each other. Lansbury used to say at the Mission that only the love of Christ could save us, but now the rich have taken on Christ's work. That is what has made Bow and Bromley such a paradise.

* * *

THE BANKERS' FRIENDS.

Labour in office shows how it practices continuity in capitalist policy "The Times" complimented "Labour" on effecting such a close relation between finance and industry when they got the Banks to agree to rationalize the factories. The Bankers, with Labour's approval, formed the National Industrial Development Co., Ltd. Montagu Norman, of the Bank of England; Sir Guy Granet, Railway Director, and of Higginson & Co., World Financiers; Baron Schroeder, famous in the Ruhr Steel Combines, and of Schroeder's, the New York Bankers; Peacock, of Baring Brothers; and Wagg, the Finance Merchant—these became the directors of the new concern to buy up and rationalize the profitable indus-

tries. Once Labour screamed about the Bankers' power! That was only when out of office. Now they have earned the affection of "finance" by encouraging Bankers' control over production more than ever.

While "Labour" cried out that their schemes were being shelved because local bodies were sabotaging them, they appointed a Public Loans Board to advise what loans should be made to local authorities. They appointed the same board of Bankers the Conservatives had selected five years before. Then a few backbenchers objected to Lord Hunsdon being on it, because he said the miners should be starved into surrender in 1926. The Labour Government have drawn fulsome praise from the poisonous Newspaper Press by squashing their own members and getting Lord Hunsdon re-appointed with Liberal and Tory support in Parliament.

Yet there are still workers who tell us that Labour is opposed to the Capitalists! Let them learn from such practices as the above how well the Labour servants obey their masters. When the workers become Socialist, and control the Parliaments for Socialism the Labour politicians will be able to seek solace with their friends, the Bankers, and they can take the Mace with them to where people want entertainment, instead of a sane social system.

* * *

THE CONFESSIONS OF A CLYDE "RED."

The only time in my life that I have allied myself with the enemies of the workers has been since I came to the House of Commons, and that is by the order of the Labour Government. Almost every time I go into the Division Lobby I join such tried and trusted friends of the Labour Party as Lloyd George, his daughter, Sir Herbert Samuel, etc. They are keeping the Labour Party in office on condition that the workers and the Labour Party programme are deserted.

Thus writes the Labour M.P. for Shettleston ("Forward," August 2nd). He was, however, the official Labour candidate, and stood for the official Labour Party Programme. He was attacked during the election by another Labourite, Mr. C. Diamond, who has been on three occasions official Labour Candidate, and who stated that he has supported the Labour Party because it is not committed to Socialism.

The Party that the Member for Shettleston—McGovern—stands for, is not out for the working class. Read his own words:—

There is no danger of chasing away the Liberal votes, as they have all joined us at Westminster. The Labour Cabinet coddle them too much to drive them away, and are more concerned about them than about the working class.

He became the official Labour Candidate—because it's the best way to get elected. "Getting in"—that's the game, even if it means going into the Lobby to vote against the programme he ran on.

The little conflict between the "wings" has now been settled at a joint meeting of the Labour Party and the I.L.P., and the following terms were agreed upon:—

(1) That the I.L.P. accepts the Labour Party Annual Conference as the supreme authority of the organised political movement of the workers.

(2) That the I.L.P. wishes to remain in affiliation with the Labour Party. (*Forward*, Aug. 2.)

So, now Lloyd George, the I.L.P., and the Labour Party may continue their united front—in the same Lobby.

C.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

		LONDON DISTRICT.
Sunday	...	Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m. Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m. Victoria Park, 4 p.m. Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 7.30 p.m.
Wednesday	...	Stepney Green, 8 p.m. Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m. Thane Villas, Hornsey Road, 8 p.m. Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m. Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m. Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 8 p.m. Battersea, Mossbury Road, 8.15 p.m.
Friday	...	Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.
Saturday	...	EDINBURGH.
Wednesdays	...	The Mound, 8 p.m.
Fridays	...	The Mound, 7 p.m.
Saturdays	...	GLASGOW DISTRICT.
Sundays	...	West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.
Thursdays	...	Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

Fill in and post to 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E. 1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me the "Socialist Standard" for 12 months, for which I enclose 2/6.

Name

Address

Date

(If required only for 6 months, send 1/3).

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Mondays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.

HULL.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month at 213 Beverly Road. Communications to M. V. Coupland at above address.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison, 111, West Park-street, Salford, Manchester. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month at 8.15 p.m., at 183 Oxford Road, All Saints.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Sec., E. Carnell, 110, Beechcroft Rd., S.W.17. Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m. Lecture last Thursday in month, at Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec. F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N. 8. Branch meets 2nd 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m. at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 314. VOL. 27.]

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

THE PROFIT-SHARING SNARE. CO-PARTNERSHIP SCHEMES EXPOSED.

THE ECONOMICS OF CHEAPNESS.

Great Britain is losing her hold over the world market. That means producing firms are finding it harder to compete successfully against producers abroad. Every scheme is being tried to regain lost trade and to increase the quantity of goods sold. Industry to-day is carried on for the profit of the owners, and more trade, therefore, means more profit.

The most effective way to capture markets is to sell cheaper than your rivals. How can goods be sold at a lower price? Modern industry answers—"Reduce the time taken to produce them." That is how the modern cry of Rationalisation pays tribute to the economics of Karl Marx.

Marx showed that the average amount of time taken under prevailing conditions to produce an article determined its value. So in order to sell cheaper, the manufacturers to-day use every possible method to lessen the time necessary to produce their wares.

Piece-work rates, bonus systems and other profit-sharing schemes are adopted to arouse the worker to greater effort; to produce quicker; and to save waste. This enables the employer to produce more cheaply, whilst the workers are told they will share in the increased profits.

THE "PACE-MAKER" AND HIS FUNCTION.

The cotton trade to-day is in decline, and these speeding-up methods are being pushed in Lancashire to enable the employers to ensure their profits. The *Manchester Guardian* recently had an article suggesting piece-work and bonus systems as a remedy. The fixing of piece-work rates, however, we are told by the writer, is difficult, as it means getting "pace-makers," or sloggers who can lead the rest by turning out more goods. The standards of price per piece

can be fixed more profitably for the employers if really rapid workers are employed as "time setters" to cut down the time required to turn out each job. Thus the Taylor system in all its variations of efficiency is offered as a cure for "Lancashire ills." Its adoption will certainly raise the employers' profits, but will simply mean in practice that fewer workers are required to do the same amount of work. Any apparent increase in wages by sharing in the profits is only in actual practice a reduction of wages in relation to the increased amount of work performed. The employer's share is that his profits are increased vastly. The worker is paid a fraction more than before for turning out a much larger product. The sole result is that the increased efforts of the workers reduce the "share" of the total product given back to the workers as wages. That is why prominent employers are so much in favour of these piece-work and profit sharing systems.

One feature of all these piece price and premium bonus ideas was noted by the *Manchester Guardian* writer; that is the policy of firms cutting down the piece rate once they find efficiency going up and adding to the workers' wage. So almost as fast as the workers' output is increased by slogging, the unit price comes down and the workers are back again to subsistence wages. Once the workers raise output it becomes the average standard for all to comply with in order to get the basic wage.

THE CO-PARTNERSHIP FRAUD.

Many leading employers have recently boomed another artful dodge to ensnare the workers into working in harmony with the employers. Co-partnership or shareholding by employees is the stale device which is being revived. The Economic League—

that body of employers' friends—issue many leaflets praising co-partnership as the way to social peace and workers' prosperity.

One of the great examples of this scheme is the South Metropolitan Gas Works, who smashed their employees' strike on the profit-sharing issue, and afterwards raised hours from 8 to 12 per day. This firm boasts that since "allowing" employees to own shares the efficiency has increased, the price of gas has fallen, and better still—profits have risen considerably. In this firm the profit-sharing scheme was made compulsory, so that all workers would take a "greater interest in their work." It worked out in practice that fewer men were required to do the same amount of work and the tiny "share" of the workers in dividend at the end of the year proved that the owners had really shared in the added wages due to the workers for their increased efforts and output.

THE WORKERS GET THE "LEAVINGS."

Lord Leverhulme, of the Soap Trust, was a great believer in co-partnership. But on his death we found from the published will that he owned the entire two millions of ordinary shares himself. Not much co-partnership there! And by "allowing" some workers to have special "employees' shares," receiving interest after the ordinary shareholders, Lord Leverhulme was able to pile up millions in profit. In his book on the "Six Hour Day," he points out that he always insisted that the co-partner workers must share in the losses as well as profits. This policy was calculated to teach the workers the importance of helping the firm to make profits.

All co-partnership and similar schemes are put forward to kill any organised efforts by the workers to increase their share of the wealth produced. Under the spell of the "divi." or bonus, the worker is to be enticed away from the struggle to push up his wages or in any way reduce the employers' surplus.

THE CO-PARTNERS GET THE SACK.

Cadbury's and Rowntree's are examples of "good" firms with profit-sharing policies. Recent efforts on the part of these companies to hold or increase their trade led them to use more machinery to reduce the labour costs. A reduction of workers employed resulted, and Rowntree appealed through the press for employers to give his superseded men a job. After all the work

and efforts of the employees in these firms, working hard to produce profits they were replaced by machines! The co-partners were out of work! Do you need more evidence of the function of bonus systems and co-partnership?

THE FRUITS OF PROFIT SHARING.

In the Ministry of Labour Gazette (July, 1930) appears a complete survey of all profit-sharing and co-partnership schemes operating during 1929. These schemes numbered 495, and were participated in by 260,000 employees out of 531,000 employed in these firms. The report tells us that "in all industries taken together nearly one half of the schemes started have come to an end." We are also informed that "a considerable number of the schemes admit employees to participation in the profits only to the extent that they are able and willing to deposit savings with the firm or purchase shares."

A famous firm practising co-partnership is the Eastman Kodak Co. Listen to Mr. George Eastman's testimony of the profitable results to the firm:—

In 1919 several thousand pounds' worth of shares were distributed to our employees. One result was that after handing over to the workers one-third of my shares, the value of the remaining holdings soon climbed a third higher than the previous total. That was not the purpose in distributing the shares, but the result shows the business value of the act. Since the shares were distributed the market value has gone up over 150 per cent. Part of this increase in value unquestionably has been due to the wide distribution among workers and officials.—(*Copartnership*, Dec., 1927.)

THE CHEMICAL COMBINE.

Sir Alfred Mond (now Lord Melchett) is one of the chief apostles of the co-partnership device. He boasted at the annual meeting of the Imperial Chemical Industries, 1929, that 53,000 employees held shares, totalling about 850,000 shares. (This is about 17 shares each.) They are allowed to buy ordinary shares at market prices less 2/6 per share, and preference shares at the fixed price of 21/6 each. He "trusts" his employees not to sell their shares. Why so many employees put their savings into "their firm's" shares is easily understood, as it is thought to be a means of being kept on or possibly useful in promotion. How little the workers own in the mighty Imperial Chemical Industries can be seen when it is found that the capital of this combine is over 76 millions. The co-partners have no control over "their" jobs nor any control

over the business. What are a few shares owned by each worker against the huge amount owned by such Directors of the firm as Lord Melchett, Lord Birkenhead, Lord Colwyn, Sir Max Muspratt, Henry Mond, Marquess of Reading, Lord Weir, etc.?

LONGER HOURS FOR CO-PARTNERS.

How little Lord Melchett is interested in workers' conditions can be seen by his efforts in Parliament to get a longer working day for miners. The Amalgamated Anthracite Collieries (owned by Imperial Chemicals) controls 12 coal concerns, and has paid huge dividends in recent years.

Who really owns most of the capital can be seen by its share-list, where dozens of shareholders own 10,000 shares and upwards each, and prominent holders like Guest, Keen & Nettlefolds own £395,000 in shares. Lady Buckland, the well-known miner, owns £395,000 in shares in company with two other aristocrats.

Is this an example of the widespread diffusion of capital that the Economic League and Mond refer to?

How co-partnership rivets the employees to the firm which holds their "savings" can be seen from Mond's speech at a co-partnership luncheon:—

What is the effect of making them shareholders? We saw some of it in the last General Strike. Not one workman in Brunner, Mond's left his job! while many were heard to observe that they did not intend to jeopardise their dividends at the dictates of any outside person. In the business with which I am connected we have been free from Labour disputes for fifty years.

Lord Melchett is very reticent about the wages paid by his alkali works, mines and every other of the 50 concerns amalgamated into his trust. But the Chemical Workers' Union are continually protesting against the "low" wages paid in that industry practically controlled by the combine.

The workmen co-partners have no control of the share market. Should they want to sell their shares just now what will they get? £1 ordinary shares have fallen from 45/- last year to 19/- to-day. And the 10/- deferred shares have fallen to 5/- each. (*Observer*, August 3rd, 1930).

THE RIGHT "SPIRIT" FOR SLAVES.

Perhaps there is no better indication of Lord Melchett's policy than the following:

After all, there is no more competitive spirit than that displayed by the British people. If you

put them into a football match they will kill themselves every Saturday afternoon for nothing. Why not introduce the same spirit into industry?—(*Copartnership*, Dec., 1927.)

This is from his speech at the same co-partnership luncheon. How tragically true! that is the spirit of industry—killing themselves for nothing!

Some of the conditions of the Imperial Chemical's co-partners' scheme are interesting:

The scheme is an investment one, and while no absolute restriction is placed upon the workers, they will not be expected to speculate with their shares. The directors reserve the right to refuse to allot further shares to a worker who does not enter into the right spirit of the scheme.

The maximum individual allotment will be such number of shares as can be purchased by an expenditure of a sum not exceeding 20 per cent. of the annual wages or salary of the employee. To this 20 per cent. an additional 1 per cent. for each year of service above five may be added.—(*Copartnership*, Dec., 1927.)

The conditions are, of course, laid down by the firm! The worker must enter into "the right spirit," and he must not buy (even if he could afford it) too many shares. Perhaps he might then give up working and, like the real "partners," live upon profits!

The purpose behind Imperial Chemicals "profit sharing" can be gleaned from the following paragraph:—

This departure from the normal method of dealing with manual workers is described in the current issue of the Imperial Chemical Industries Magazine as an "experiment," the continuance of which must depend on its economic result. The creation of the Staff Grade will involve a heavy initial cost which must be balanced by compensating increase of efficiency.—(*Copartnership*, Sept., 1928.)

LION AND LAMB SHALL UNITE!

Another well-known "Copartnership" firm is the Brush Electrical Engineering Co. The Chairman of that concern, speaking of the results of copartnership in his firm, says:—

The scheme also gives us confidence of being able to maintain a fairly satisfactory dividend on the share capital, and it enables us to satisfy our customers that good service deserves a fair and adequate, though not excessive, reward for the shareholders and the staff of workers, both mental and manual.—(*Copartnership*, Sep., 1928.)

The same employer, speaking at the annual meeting of his firm this year, explained some of his principles thus:—

1. Greater economy by elimination of waste.
2. Higher efficiency by elimination of inefficient machinery and methods.

3. Larger output to neutralise low prices by removal of Trade Union restrictions.—(*Copartnership*, June, 1930.)

The last principle is striking, in view of the fact that the supporters of the movement, as the above magazine shows, are prominent Labour leaders, like Citrine, Ben Turner, E. F. Wise, E. L. Poulton (General Secretary of Boot and Shoe Workers). This last leader spoke at the Copartnership Conference, May 13th, this year, and he served up this slop:—

If the copartnership principles are properly adopted, we shall soon get out of the slough in which we find ourselves at the present time.

THE FINANCIAL STEAM ROLLER.

One prominent copartner advocate is Angus Watson, of the Newcastle firm selling Skipper Sardines. His firm was recently bought out by the monster international trust, Unilever, Ltd. Angus Watson resigned as Director, and commented very bitterly on the effects of combination of firms and rationalisation. The worker who had played his part building up the firm's assets was ruthlessly pushed out by machinery and the power of capital. What can copartnership do in face of the modern International Trust?

Edward Cadbury, the cocoa manufacturer, admits our indictment. Speaking at the Quaker Employers' Conference:—

He said they would all agree that the workman ought to have some voice in the management, but at present there was no way in which he could be given any effective control in large scale industry; stressing the words "effective control."—(*Copartnership*, Sept., 1928.)

Reviewing the Life of Lord Leverhulme, by his son, the same paper says:—

Lord Leverhulme's ideas did not extend to giving any share of the control to the workers. In his particular case he did not see the reason, and perhaps there was not the demand.

All the evidence we have produced shows that copartnership and profit-sharing schemes are merely another method of inducing the workers to continue a system in which the real control and ownership is in the hands of the employers and in which all the work must be carried on by the workers. C.

Contributions are invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

YOUR Newsagent can obtain this Journal from W. H. Smith & Son, Strand House, W.C.

WOMEN'S FREEDOM

Just lately women have been taking an active and successful part in science, sport, and politics. This is loudly acclaimed by some as the evidence of women's greater freedom.

Other observers are just as loudly denouncing women's activities in the world of commerce. They sadly deplore the fact that, "forsaking her natural mission in life as wife and mother," she is taking men's jobs and swelling the numbers of unemployed males.

The Socialist adopts neither of these view-points. On the one hand, the much-vaunted freedom for most women is largely a myth, and on the other women are only taking the position that capitalism assigns to them.

The toll that the last war took of the men was a big factor in bringing women to the fore and making their value realised by the employers. They found that female labour was more tractable and better suited to certain classes of work. Powerful machinery made male labour unnecessary in what had been heavy work, and as female labour was much cheaper, the men were only slowly replaced, and vast numbers not at all. But already labour-saving devices are robbing the women and girls of their jobs, and unemployment is now their share.

Girls as well as boys now receive a commercial education, and every year thousands leave school and are clamouring for jobs. Hence the new measure for raising the school-leaving age. This at one end, and pensions at an earlier age at the other, are some of the methods by which the Labour Government hope to solve the problem of unemployment.

Naturally, the altered conditions are breeding a type of girl and woman different from those reared in the last century. Better physical and mental training is producing girls as alert and active as their brothers, and the female wage-slave is subject to exploitation in many new occupations. This is happening in an age when many new fields of research and activity are being opened up, and naturally one expects to see women enter them, since conditions have made her fitted to do so.

What is, or is not, a "natural mission" is a debatable subject, but it is quite clear that the capitalist system of society does not look after working-class women in the

home any more satisfactorily than it does in the factory, as is shown by the enormous number of preventable deaths in child-birth.

Now let us examine the greater freedom view-point, and summarise the so-called gains of women during the last few years. Those who have the necessary money have gained the right of entry into the medical and other professions. Women now have the right to vote equally with men, and there have been modifications of the laws of property and divorce. Far be it from us to decry these advancements, but we must put them in their proper places.

The laws regarding property are made in the interests of the property holders to adjust differences between the sections of property owners. This, then, is of no importance to the women wage-earners who have no property. Divorce proceedings can now be taken under the "Poor Persons" system, but working-class women have often to excuse their husbands' conduct because they have to face the serious problem of loss of support and break-up of home, etc., if they divorce them.

The right of entering into the universities and professions again does not affect the workers much. The vote is certainly a valuable weapon if used rightly by the workers, but at present the women are as blind as the men and do not realise their potential power. Although women like to bask in the reflected glory of some of their sex, they must remember that Lady Bailey, Dr. Marie Stopes, Lady Astor, and the Duchess of Athol, and the rest did not reside in Bethnal Green nor work at the wire works. One lucky Amy Johnson is not an indication of bright prospects for women in general.

There is another side to remember about these feats of sports and science. The adventurers of old paved the way for the commercial routes of to-day, and civil aviation of to-day is linked up with military aviation. Science not only find out dangerous microbes; it discovers poisonous gases.

Thus our scientists and men and women speed and distance record breakers are mixed blessings; their discoveries may be the very means by which their sons and daughters are killed in the next war. The Labour Government has voted £18,000,000 for Air Force development, one of the results of increased aircraft efficiency.

Boiled down, then, the question of

women's freedom resolves itself into exactly the same problem as that of the men. World development has decreed that women shall play a part that is in keeping with the conditions under which they live, and to the women who do not own property this means that under capitalism they will be as much wage-slaves as their brothers. There can be no freedom for the workers, men or women, while they are exploited. Working-class women have an historic mission to perform with their men. There is no time for entering into things that concern the masters only. Let the property holders equalise the holding and sharing of their property between the sexes if they like. Already in the U.S.A. nearly half the property is owned by women capitalists. It matters not if our employers are men or women, but it does matter a great deal whether we ourselves understand our class interests. The emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex, and that is the only cause worthy of our support. Sex equality, birth control, family endowments, etc., are only methods of side-tracking, and women should not be drawn into these worthless controversies.

Mrs. O.

ECCLES, LANCASHIRE.

Will members and sympathisers living in this neighbourhood communicate with J. Lea, at 5, Gaskell Road, Barton Lane, Eccles, with a view to forming a branch.

Sunday Evening Meetings.

Head Office.

Date.	Subject.	Speaker.
October 5th	D. Goldberg.
'Is Human Nature a Barrier to Socialism.'		
October 12th	E. Lake.
'How Society Evolves.'		
October 19th	H. Milton.
'The Socialist and Trade Unionism.'		
October 26th	H. Waite.
'Why the Workers should Support the Socialist Party.'		

All invited.

Admission Free.

Discussion and Question.

Commences at 8 p.m.

A SOCIALIST SEARCHLIGHT.

WHERE ARE THE "REDS" OF YESTERYEAR?

The Labour Party has finance, positions, a large following, and is popular and respectable. That explains its attraction for those elements which were so busy a little while since supporting Bolshevism, insurrection and similar gospels. In the official "Labour Magazine" for June there are three "converts" writing for it. Walton Newbold, late Communist M.P., Peter Petroff, the late Communist official in Russia, and R. M. Fox, late follower of Larkin. In the political arena crowds of one-time Communists have climbed on board the "Labour" engine of Capitalism. When it was apparent that Communist membership was a hindrance to adoption by the Labour Party, they dropped their Communist association. The Third International, faced with declining membership and the need for peaceful commercial relations with Capital, spent less money on propaganda. Thus, many left the Communists for the party they had denounced. Newbold, Whitehead, Windsor, J. S. Clarke, Ellen Wilkinson, R. Williams, Wall, the Secretary of the London Trades Council, Colyer, late Treasurer of the Communist Party, Mellor, now Editor of the "Daily Herald," all sought the genial circles of the Anti-Socialist Labour Party.

The Communists boosted new leaders for Labour, like Sam Elsbury, of the Clothing Workers, Alex. Gossip, of the Furnishing Trades, and Cook, of the Miners. Now they are mostly denounced as enemies. "Making" leaders and then pouring venom on them is a special feature of Communist work. It attracted the would-be leader to the party by its programme of "Down with the old leaders," and then sobbed because new leaders got the jobs with their assistance and then kicked the party overboard.

Edgar Lansbury has faded out of the Communist picture. Ashleigh, once on the staff of the Communist Press, has stopped "preparing for the Revolution." The Russian Oil Products, Argos, and other Soviet firms, were a happy hunting ground for those with the "Communist ticket," and once safely settled in the jobs, the noisy slogan-slingers forget all about "the Revolution round the corner." You don't

run after a 'bus when you have already caught it!

The conflict in the Russian Party resulted in "New Lines" and new deviations being send round to Communists' Parties of the world. Then sprang up the various sections of the C.P. here and abroad, such as Trotskyists, Left and Right Wing Deviators, etc.

The contest for positions resulted in many of the "Early Fathers" or Pioneers getting ousted, and the new Political Bureau saw that their opponents lost their old positions. Hence names like T. A. Jackson do not now adorn the pages of the Communist papers. These sheets are now left with less philosophic contents, such as "Prepare for August 1st," and "A Boon for Ladies," "How to get a paper pattern for a shirt," etc. Soviet Russia has had a very poor advertisement in the parties she adopted. In spite of all the enthusiasm and inspiration Russia aroused, the Communist Party has declined from 20,000 in 1921 to 3,500 in 1929.

* * *

LABOUR NOT A CLASS PARTY.

To those simple folk who believe that the Labour Party is a party based upon working class interests, we quote the following from the final Election address of the Labour Party broadcast by Ramsay MacDonald during the General Election of 1929 from Newcastle B.B.C. Station (May 28th, 1929).

It shows the appeal of "Labour" to all classes, and repudiates any class aims.

Another charge is that we are a Class Party because the Party was created for the purpose of bringing the life experience of the great mass of our people to guide political and economic policy. Against us our opponents say that they stand for national unity and such-like. You cannot talk of national unity unless that unity embraces all classes and functions which give services to the whole varied life of the community. I cannot understand how it is that intelligent and honest people can continue to think that Labour is a Class Party. If I had time to-night, and if it were profitable, I could prove to you not only the contrary, but I could turn the tables upon our Conservative antagonists and show that on their minds, on the composition of their Party, on their funds, on their appeals, and their achievements class and sectional interests are deeply stamped. One of the great reasons why I belong to the Labour Party and hold the Socialist views of what a wise and just social structure is, is because I detest class politics, and want to end them in real national unity.

K.

PARTY ACTIVITIES.

During the summer there has been an encouraging increase in the propaganda activities of the branches. Old stations have been maintained and several new ones opened up for outdoor meetings, with considerable success in some cases.

* * *

BATTERSEA.

The Battersea Branch has been holding good meetings on Clapham Common on Sunday evenings. Owing to the failing light, these meetings are now held at 3.30 in the afternoon. Sales of literature have been fair, and efforts have been rewarded with a few entrants to the Branch.

The Buckmore Road meetings on Friday evenings were abandoned, as the pitch proved unsuitable. Mossbury Road, the new station, shows signs of being more useful. Interest in the principles of Socialism, as opposed to the quackery and confusion preached by the Labour leaders, is made apparent by the questions and keenness to hear our case.

* * *

EAST LONDON.

The East London Branch continues to hold meetings in Victoria Park. Keen interest has been maintained, despite counter-attractions round the platforms of Hot-Gospellers and other upholders of wage-slavery.

Audiences, large and attentive, gather round us, and questions are put from many who are beginning to appreciate the correctness of our case.

The L.C.C. ban on literature and collections hampers the extension of the Branch's activities, but does not damp our enthusiasm. The mid-week meeting-place at Stepney Green Gardens is a new station for us. We anticipated great difficulties in the district, but it has, from our propaganda point of view, proved a great success. Audiences have been regular, and the inquiries intelligent. Questions have been mainly on Labour Party policy and upon matters that appear problems to those unacquainted with our case. These, and opposition from Communists advocating violence as a means of emancipation, have been effectively met by facts and Socialist arguments.

The Branch have obtained the use of the

Bancroft Road Library Lecture Hall for their coming winter campaign, commencing October 2nd. (See notice in this issue.) Here will be an opportunity for all who take an interest in our propaganda to hear our message undisturbed by the distracting influences of the street corner.

* * *

PADDINGTON.

The Paddington Branch have been very active. Sales of literature and collections have been good, and several new members have been gained.

* * *

HEAD OFFICE.

The Sunday evening meetings which are to be held throughout the winter began in September and promise to be as successful as those held last year.

Particulars of forthcoming meetings are advertised elsewhere in this issue.

* * *

SATURDAY EVENINGS.

Meetings are being arranged on Saturday evenings at Head Office, 42, Great Dover Street, for the discussion of questions of interest to members and sympathisers, varied by an occasional social. Admission is free to all our meetings.

MEETINGS.

EAST LONDON.

BANCROFT ROAD LIBRARY,
LECTURE HALL

THURSDAY EVENINGS 8 P.M. PROMPT.

Commencing Thursday, October 2nd

Date.	Subject.	Speaker.
October 2nd	'What the Socialist Party Stands for.'	E. Hardy.
October 9th	'Socialism and the Meantime.'	E. Lake.
October 16th	'Socialism and Religion.'	W. McHaffie
October 23rd	'Socialism and Parliamentarianism.'	Gilmac.
October 30th	'The Labour Party and Socialism.'	A. Jacobs.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.

Admission Free.

All Invited.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.

Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

OCTOBER,



1930

LESSONS FROM THE GERMAN ELECTIONS.

Germany has just had a general election, the results of which call for some comment.

One of the most striking lessons of German politics since the war has been the steady fall in the voting for the German Social Democratic Party. In 1919 they had the vote of 45 per cent. of the electorate; since then the vote has steadily declined until in this election they have secured only about 25 per cent. of the votes cast. Yet in 1919 German Social Democracy had control of Governmental power, and one of its leading members, Ebert, was German President until his death in 1925!

What is the explanation of the fall in the Social Democratic vote? The answer is simple.

In the years before the war our "labour" opponents, who opposed our revolutionary attitude, brought forward the alleged progress of the movement in Germany as evidence to support their reformist policy, and pestered us with "the growth of the Socialist vote in Germany." The war destroyed a good deal of this sand castle and made plain what little progress Socialism had actually made among the people who made up the German Social

Democracy. The post-war years have made the position still more plain, and have gradually disillusioned and discouraged a large number of the blind followers of the one-time worshipped "leaders."

The millions who voted "Socialist" in Germany were like the millions who voted "labour" in England—they did not understand or desire Socialism as they did not know what it involved. At the most what they wanted and expected was an amelioration of the worst of the evils that they suffered, and they relied on the promises of the German Social Democratic Party and the English Labour Party to obtain this result. But Socialism is the only means by which the workers' position can be materially improved; while capitalism remains in existence it must necessarily go on producing the evils of capitalism. Therefore, as neither of the Parties had a Socialist electorate behind them, conditions have got worse instead of improving—to the disappointment of the electorate.

The failure of the German Social Democratic Party to live up to its promises, although it has been easily the largest Party in Germany since the war, and also the fact that it has in various ways assisted the German capitalists in their exploitation of the workers, is the explanation of the disappointment and disgust of increasing numbers of its former supporters.

It will be noticed that the Communist vote is higher this election than in the last, but they have obtained a lower percentage of the votes cast this time than they did in 1924. They have temporarily gained owing to the political ignorance and hopelessness of part of the electorate. However, the life of a Communist Party is one of ups and downs—mainly downs of late years.

The Fascist Party (or German National Socialist Party, as it calls itself) represents in the main the groups of officers, small investors and small proprietors that have suffered economically during the post-war period, but its main actions are determined by German heavy industry, from which it draws a considerable part of its funds. It suits the large German capitalists to use this body as strike breakers and bogey men to keep down wages and frighten any drastic reforms out of the minds of the Social Democrats.

The irony of the situation is that the German Social Democrats are largely responsible for the existence of this body, as they

JESUS AND ECONOMICS.

DEAN INGE ON MARX.

THE SPIRITUAL MESSAGE.

Dean Inge is the holy incumbent of St. Paul's Cathedral, the central palace of His Most High God. The divine and duly anointed Dean treated Leeds on July 18th to a lecture, "Christianity and Socialism." The special body of mutually hostile but loving Christians he addressed was the Wesleyan Methodists. Not the Primitive ones, but those who follow the meek and lowly "Suffer not a witch to live" Wesley. The Dean's address not only smote those "Christian Socialists," I.L.P.-ers, etc., who find their "Socialism" in the New Testament, but warmed the heart of the rich who frequent St. Paul's, by showing that Christ had no economic gospel and had no evil designs on their treasure.

"The Gospel had a message of moral and spiritual regeneration, not of social reform."

The moral and spiritual regeneration message, however, must have been lost in transit. Neither by the wording of Christ nor by the conduct of his countless millions of disciples can we decipher it. The message seems to have missed the sacred Dean himself, for it was not long since that he advised that agitators should be taken (in a brotherly spirit) and put up against a wall—and shot.

Let us, however, get to the cream of the lecture, if there can be any cream in such a spiritual message.

WHY THEY COULDN'T FOLLOW CHRIST.

Christ was not in the ordinary sense an ascetic. There was no doubt He used hyperbolic language which could hardly be continued in popular preaching. He did not shun the society of the rich or repel them in any way. His counsel of perfection to the young man who thought that he had kept to the Commandments was not addressed to everybody. In those days perhaps a man could hardly follow Christ in His journeys without giving up or endangering his hoarded wealth. There was no regular investment of capital in those days. It was hardly necessary to say that even if He had wished to lay down a scheme of socialism—and such an idea never occurred to Him—the conditions of Palestine under Pontius Pilate and Herod would have put it out of the question. His travelling missionaries were to live on alms like begging friars, but this proved nothing. His own little band seemed to have carried a bag with money in it and to have bought food when they needed it.

Christ was a prophet, not a legislator. He gives us principles, not rules, and we are meant to use common-sense in interpreting them. Some

directly and indirectly assisted in its formation. When in power in 1919, they welcomed the returning soldier back "to his own country," but decreed that the private soldier should lay down his arms whilst the officers could retain theirs. The S.D.P. also assisted in the formation of armed bodies that were afterwards used against them.

The German Fascist Party came into being as the result of the dissolution of groups which originated from the "Orgesch," a group formed in Bavaria by a state official named Escherisch. The elements composing it were in the main the same then as now. Its aims were similar to those of the Italian Fascisti, to whom it gave assistance in 1921-22.

Anyone who reads, in the "18th Brumaire," Marx's description of the "Society of December," the hirelings of Napoleon III in the middle of the last century, will recognise the similarity in constitution and methods between it and the German and Italian Fascisti, and also how large capital uses such bodies for its own ends.

The German election was fought on the question of increased taxation to meet the growing unemployment problem. The issue was one that admirably suited the Fascists, who put forward airy phrases about better management of funds and the reduction of expenses; and also endeavoured to play upon patriotic feeling aroused by the heaviness of the war indemnity.

As the German S.D.P. have not advocated anything beyond ordinary capitalist measures to meet Germany's difficulties, their answer to the opposition is weak, and they suffer from the swing of the pendulum.

The leaders of German Social Democracy who took over power with quaking knees after the war were afraid to stand or fall by their former protestations. Now, after devoting themselves during these years to the salvation of German capitalism, they are losing support among the workers. Some of their members, such as Noske, have acquired reputations for blood-thirstiness and treachery to the working-class that will be remembered and will help the German workers to realise that they must rely upon their own knowledge and their own efforts to free themselves from capitalist bondage, and cast off the outworn and slavish idea of leadership.

people reject Christianity because they do not understand it; others, because they do understand it. To the latter class unquestionably belong the disciples of Karl Marx. For what excites their passionate hatred to Christianity is precisely that idealistic standard of values which cuts the ground from under the feet of their savage and vindictive materialism.

"WHERE YOUR TREASURE IS—"

Christianity is an idealistic gospel opposed to the materialism of the Socialist. The Dean has made that plain. But the reason why you could not expect a man to follow Christ in those days was a base, sordid, material one. The spiritual Dean says that it would endanger a man's hoarded wealth. There were no Selfridge's safety deposits then. Amongst such a religious people it would, perhaps, be too much to expect that those who remained behind would not lay hands on "the stuff." The plundering generations of Christians since then are evidence on that point! And with what feelings of pain and regret the Dean must have told the audience that "there was no regular investment of capital in those days." No shares, no Stock Exchange, no dividends, not even an opportunity for eminent clerics to promote peace by buying gun companies' shares, war loans, or brewery shares for a change. So the sad listeners to Christ must have felt cut up that they could not go and leave their shekels behind safely among the brethren and sistren, nor change it into scrip. Hence this spiritual and by no means material reason prevented them journeying with Christ to snatch souls from outer darkness. These reasons, mind you, are not mine, but those of the immaterial, idealistic Dean Inge.

MORE MATERIALISM.

Another very worldly, material fact that prevented Christ from advocating Socialism was "that the conditions of Palestine under Pontius Pilate and Herod would have put it out of the question." So, again, the explanation of this opponent of materialism is just an ordinary material one—conditions were unsuitable!

Perhaps the light of St. Paul's picked up the wrong notes for his lecture. An idealistic standard of values which could not be carried out because of conditions! A gospel "which wasn't addressed to everybody," eminently spiritual, but which had to be modified because of economic facts!

Special taxation of large incomes might be desirable on public grounds, but it was no sub-

stitute for Christian love or charity, and could not claim to be in accordance with Christian economics.

We were beginning to think that Dean Inge knew the Gospels. He started out by saying Christ dealt with spiritual things, not social ones, and, lo and behold, he discovers Christian economics!

The soothing syrup is offered to the rich, that Christ did not mean them to pay high taxes for running their system.

HEARTS AND ECONOMICS.

Karl Marx and his followers understood Christianity! What an admission for one so gloomy as the learned parson. But what the idealistic standard of values of Christianity are, or the nature of savage materialism, we were not informed. How, otherwise than by material alterations, can we deal with the poverty and slavery to-day? "A new heart and a new spirit," or "Love and charity," these phrases that come so easily from the Dean! The followers of Christ have had two thousand years to display the meaning of these things. From 1914 to 1918 love and charity was quite absent from the language of "the faith" at St. Paul's, etc.

Challenged for an economic policy to deal with the condition of the workers, these savage idealists can only talk about hearts and spirits, even after admitting that even in Christ's time the conditions dominated the situation.

It is quite true that Christ had no economic gospel and no Socialism. It is equally true that Christ had no plan of emancipation for the slavery of his time or ours. So we remain materialists with a policy based upon the conditions and lessons of to-day.

The leading Conservative organ of Scotland, *The Scotsman*, commenting the same day on Dean Inge's speech, was compelled to adopt much of the materialists' attitude:

To some extent social organisation was of little importance to the early Christians, for they lived in the daily expectation of witnessing the end of the world. As Christ refused to interfere in questions of politics—"render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's"—so there is no type of economics prescribed for Christians. And in the course of centuries the Churches have in fact changed their ground in relation to certain of the manifestations of economic activity. For example, usury was once condemned by the Church and its existence was disguised by legal subterfuge. The Reformation supplied an ethical basis for the development of capitalism. It was Puritan doctrine that waste of time was a deadly

sin, and that everyone must work at his calling. Baxter, indeed, argued that "if you refuse a less gainful way you cross one of the ends of your calling." Without over-emphasising the connection between Puritanism and capitalism—and it has been over-emphasised by some writers—it is significant that men who appealed for their standards to the Christian religion have extracted from it authority for fundamentally different economic doctrines. There are many sayings in the New Testament which, if put into practice literally, would bring chaos into the legal and economic system of the modern world.

Dean Inge as long ago as 1888, in his first book—"Society in Rome under the Cæsars"—pointed out the material conditions of Rome in its decline promoted the acceptance of Christianity by the slaves whose earthly miseries were so heavy. All that this pillar of the Church can now say in answer to the Socialist case is, "Look at Russia"! Russia, he claims, is an example of Marx's ideas in practice, and should be a paradise if Marx's ideas were sound. Russia, however, is not Socialism in practice, neither is it the result of applying Marx's theories. Any ordinary mind studying Marx and studying Russia would know that. Lofty and intellectual lights of the Church either don't know it, or, like Dean Inge, prefer to misrepresent the facts in order to serve his God and Mammon.

A. K.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

- J. P. BASSINDALE (Doncaster). The Socialist Party of Great Britain is not affiliated to the Labour Party or to any other party. See our Declaration of Principles and reply to J. Clifford below.
- J. CLIFFORD (Larne). The reasons why Socialists are opposed to the Labour Party are frequently given in these columns. See the issues April, May, June and August, 1929, and subsequent months.

RECEIVED FOR REVIEW.

- "Portrait of the Labour Party." Egon Wertheimer (New Edition). Pitman. 5/-
- "My Experiences as a Miner." Count Stenbock-Fexmör. Pitman 5/-
- "The Age of the Chartists." J. L. and Barbara Hammond. Longman's 12/6.

BATTERSEA.

An Indoor Meeting

will be held by the Battersea Branch in the
WAITING ROOM, LATCHMERE BATHS,
On Thursday, October 23rd, at 8.30 p.m.

Admission free. All invited.
Questions and Discussion.

STUDIES IN ECONOMIC FALLACY

INVEST YOUR SAYINGS—DON'T "SAVE" THEM.

Mr. Robert McLaurin has been writing in the Labour press, advocating that money should be turned into productive fields. The way to do it, he says, is to stop the banks paying interest on deposit accounts, and so compel the depositors to invest their "savings" in industry. The fact that we are suffering from over-production of goods is ignored by this finance reformer. If more goods were produced by more concerns being started, the situation would simply grow worse. Goods are produced for sale to-day, and as the market is already glutted in almost every trade, the suggested reform would not touch the situation. This writer says "the system worked with comparative smoothness" until 1914! Poverty, insecurity, and unemployment of wage-slaves is apparently a post-war condition to this reformer!

Proudhon and his modern followers who advocate "Free Banking," the currency cranks like Arthur Kitson, and the Labour crowd who want money reform, are all Utopians who seek a commercial competitive system without the laws of commerce or of competition. Most of them imagine that goods should be money and that banks should allow every owner of goods credit for the amount of his wealth. If the goods cannot find a market in exchange for the universal means of circulation—money—how can they find a market any easier by being put in pawn—if such a childish notion ever was adopted?

* * *

WILL REDUCED WAGES MEAN MORE WORK?

Another "short cut to more jobs" is being advocated by some employers in the press. The simple scheme suggests that the money paid to "out of works" by the Government should be handed to employers instead, to enable them to capture orders from abroad. Every unemployed man engaged by the employers will get the difference between the so-called "dole" and his usual wage, made up by the employer. Present wages prevent contracts being obtained against foreign competition—so runs the cry! The profits, of course, are quite in order! Such a pass has capitalism come

to, that the competition employers adore prevents them being able to pay a subsistence wage! Does it? They don't suggest that capitalism should be abolished, but that the ruling class as a whole should subsidise those employers who cannot pay wages and profits out of their business.

Seeing that these same people complain that foreign countries subsidise industries and pay "low" wages, where will the process of cutting wages end? The miners and many other workers in recent years have had such low wages that poor law relief has had to make them up to subsistence level. Did that prevent unemployment growing amongst them? And when the rationalisation and electrification of foreign industries is copied here more and more, the unemployed will increase. The countries of "low wages" abroad have a growing unemployed army. "Low wages" hasn't saved them.

The general adoption of the policy of supplementing part wages with so-called "doles" simply means that wages will be pushed down throughout the country. The employers who have not the capital to modernise their plants cry out for more wage reductions, and in the meantime the larger concern crushes or absorbs them.

THE ECONOMIC TREND.

It is a plausible catch-cry to shout "wages determine prices," but economic facts dispel that moonshine. Ford's Motors in their last annual report showed that where they paid the highest wage in Europe (in Denmark) output was greatest, and where they paid the lowest (Belgium) the output was least. The real basis of world competitive prices is the amount of labour that it takes on the average to produce articles with modern methods. Where manufacturers, like Ford, have the capital to buy the latest and biggest quantity of machinery, they can reduce the time taken to produce goods, and so sell for less.

The manufacturers who cry out for subsidies to help them pay wages, won't face the issue that production for the world market is wiping out many competitors and producing the combine or trust in every field. The successful firms have won by reducing costs, which means reducing the numbers of workers required to produce a given quantity of articles. Therefore, the chronic unemployment of to-day becomes a

fixed feature of capitalism. Every country and every manufacturer is out for trade, and therefore profit, and in the wild scramble the workers do not count. They just produce the wealth and under the best conditions get just about enough of it back to keep them alive.

SHALL WE DEMAND "LOWER PRICES"?

Labourites and "short-cut Socialists" are demanding cheaper goods. Consumers' Bills and anti-profiteering campaigns are on the road to cut prices. These people are chasing a Will-of-the-wisp. "Reduce the cost of living" may be a good battle-cry for those who are consumers only, but the working class is a producing class. It does all the producing, but only a part of the consuming. How much the workers consume is determined by their wages. And what determines their wages? The basis of wages is the money needed on the average to keep a worker and his family. The number demanding work and the number of jobs available decides the daily fluctuations in wages, but the average level of wages is the cost of living of the worker. When the official index figures of the cost of living show a reduction, wages are reduced accordingly. In the daily Press of July 23rd we read that the Civil Servants have just been notified that their salaries are to be reduced, as the cost of living has fallen. Therefore, the campaign for cheaper goods will simply result, if successful, in reducing the worker's wage. The money wages are only nominal—the buying power is the real wage. If the necessities of life are "high," wages may be raised to cover the increase, but the purchasing power of wages is always related to the cost of living of the workers. However cheap goods are, wages will always represent but a fraction of the wealth made by the workers.

The cry for cheapness to-day overlooks the economic tendencies of the system.

THE MARCH TO MONOPOLY.

On the one side mass production serves to produce cheaply, but alongside of that is the rising power of monopoly, rings, and trusts to corner the supply and exact monopoly prices. Many manufacturers are against the prices of necessities being raised and so driving them to pay higher wages. The general tendency of

modern capitalism, however, is to concentrate the great sources of wealth and the products into fewer and fewer hands. If nature and man are very productive, and the supply grows quicker than the demand, the owners scheme to restrict production and actually to destroy products, in order to keep prices high enough to ensure their growing profits.

Centralised production on a large scale certainly works towards reducing costs, but the great combine owners are not interested in usefulness or cheapness as such—they are interested in profits. Once they have cut out the competitors, they plan "to get all the market will bear" by controlling the market. There is, of course, a limit which they cannot go beyond without reducing the amount they can sell.

The Consumers' Leagues and similar bodies are powerless to effect their wishes, whatever Bills are passed to stem the economic tide. The concentration of wealth and the combine are the natural outgrowth of commercial competition, and can only be dealt with effectively by abolishing private and class ownership.

One other factor in "high" prices is the falling value of gold due to modern improvements in working gold-bearing ore. Thus economic development and economic laws of capitalism cannot be dodged by reform legislation. They must be understood—and then we'll fight for Socialism.

THE ECONOMICS OF "LABOUR."

David Kirkwood, of the Clyde, Labour M.P. and I.L.P. chieftain, has a mental upsurge. He has discovered how to stop the downward march of workers' conditions. He has brought in a Bill to make it illegal for employers to reduce wages. A Government in charge of the capitalist system of profit and exploitation is asked simply to decide "No more reductions in wages." Employers must not cut the workers' pay. Wages will then automatically stay put. Wages will fluctuate no longer downwards—but only upwards. Thus poverty will be grappled with.

A little economic knowledge would be dangerous to a Labour M.P. We will, however, try a small quantity.

Under this system an employer is not compelled to employ the workers seeking work. The number of men and women

seeking work being greater than the number of jobs, wages tend downwards. The market—the labour market—is the place where competition for work causes men to accept the master's terms. Having no wealth, the workers cannot hold out. Does Kirkwood's Bill abolish that market and its competition? Does it wipe out unemployment? Does it abolish the lack of property—the force that drives men to work for others for a fodder wage? Does it alter the fodder basis of wages?

No. Kirkwood, playing with effects, would like to abolish the effects of capitalist system whilst leaving the system running. It is more sensational, vote-catching, and sounds drastic; it is easier than explaining capitalism and advocating Socialism.

ECONOMIC LAWS OVERRIDE STATUTES.

A law to stop wages going down! A war might do it for a time, whilst the demand exceeded the supply of workers, but a law under capitalism cannot stop the employer buying better and more effective machinery whenever wages tend to rise, and thus pushing numbers out. The rationalisation which Kirkwood criticises (*New Leader*, July 18th) would play havoc with his "law." Centuries ago, laws were passed making it criminal to pay more or less than the wage fixed by statute. The plague had swept huge numbers of workers away, and wages rose rapidly. Conditions made the statute a dead letter. The cry of employers for labourers and the favourable situation for the men made reductions of wages impossible. Too many employers were willing to pay more than the legal wage.

When hunger drives hard, men and women go back to work even at terms (fixed with Labour Government's assistance) involving ten per cent. reduction, as in the woollen trade. What has happened to the Minimum Wage Laws "won" by miners from Lloyd George? Where are the miners' work and wages to-day? David Kirkwood, like his fellow Labour Members, should stick to "Pleasant Sunday Afternoon" meetings at the kirk.

IS SHORTER HOURS THE REMEDY?

Mr. Geo. Hicks, of the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, has been telling his Building Trade Union of the

effects of rationalisation on the building trade. One hundred and fifty thousand are out of work in this industry, but more machinery and efficiency schemes are being used every week to get the work done "cheaper." "A shorter working day," he told them, would absorb some of the unemployed, and those pushed out by machinery should be given alternative employment or fully maintained.

Hours have been continually shortened in the builders' craft, but has that absorbed the unemployed? The Union that can't win a strike over some detail of their conditions is not in a position to win full maintenance. Mr. Hicks, like most Labour leaders, is busy supporting the Labour Government, which carries on capitalism and advocates the wholesale rationalisation which he complains about to his members.

Labour leaders do not tell their members the truth that the only way out is to abolish this system by winning political power for Socialism. It's a much easier and more profitable way for leaders to keep the workers ignorant. Then they can be led.

* * *

A LESSON FOR TRADE UNIONISTS.

Whilst the Trade Union leaders are busy as Labour M.P.'s supporting rationalisation, which will add to unemployment, the Unions beg the members not to add to the financial burden of the Unions by temporary stoppages, etc. The Boot and Shoe Union used to boast that by a "no strike" policy of conciliation they had won the best conditions. Now they complain that unemployment of their members in this machine industry is draining all their funds. The Cardroom Amalgamation of Lancashire has issued a circular to its members, warning them that the scales of contributions and benefits will not stand the chronic unemployment to-day.

The eight looms per weaver scheme, however, is being put through in Lancashire, where more than one-third of the operatives are already out of work. The Labour Government's Committee of Enquiry, headed by J. R. Clynes, the Labour Minister, advised the greater rationalisation of the industry with the latest wages-saving automatic looms.

The workers in the Unions are still supporting the leaders who mislead them. Not by changing leaders, but by completely changing their ideas about society, is the

only way the members can cure the situation.

Let the working class own the machines, etc., in common. Stop improving the machinery for the masters. Organise politically to end this system of profit-making.

* * *

ANOTHER "SHELTERED TRADE" GONE.

The Railway Unions have benefited so much by brilliant leadership that since they got back their $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. reduction in wages, short time or dismissal has been the rule in the railway shops. A greater speeding up of the work is the owners' reply to the cancelled reduction of wages. Now we learn from the *Daily Herald* of June 17th that owing to the drop in the official cost of living figures, thousands of railwaymen have lost two shillings a week. Seventy-five per cent. of the railwaymen, according to the same authority, are down to the minimum rates of wages. They give the figures of £2 6s. for porters, and lampmen and permanent way men £2 8s. In the meantime the railway companies have been buying up their bus competitors, the money for which, I suppose, comes out of their losses. The Transport Unions and the Railway Union are now busy squabbling over which Union the members must join. Mr. Thomas, we expect, will add to the railway workers' prestige by finding a place in the House of Lords. Such are the fruits of conciliation in industry.

* * *

"THE IRON LAW OF WAGES."

The corner-stone of Marx's theory, as expounded in "Das Kapital," is that labour is the creator of all wealth, but that under Capitalism labour is not paid by the value it produces, but by the price of labour power as a commodity on the market. This price, according to Karl Marx, is fixed by the economic laws under which we live at a point which just secures an adequate supply of labour for industry. This he called the "Iron Law of Wages."—(H. H. Tiltman in his *Life of Ramsay MacDonald*.)

The above is an example of the ignorance of Marx's economics by the brainy bourgeoisie who write about him.

Marx did not call his law of wages the "Iron Law of Wages." In fact he exposed the "Iron Law" theory, which was taught, not by Marx, but by Lassalle. In his criticism of the Gotha programme of the German Labour Party of 1875, Marx pointed out that the so-called Iron Law of Wages was a mixture of Malthus' over-

population theory with economic facts. The "iron law of wages" presupposes that wages cannot rise owing to an increase of population taking place if the subsistence level is increased. More workers born would crowd the labour market and bring wages down. Too few workers would raise wages, which, in turn, would induce larger families, and thus, through competition for work, wages would again fall to their former level.

Marx, on the other hand, showed that the cost of subsistence was the basis of wages. The level of wages, however, was not fixed and was not like iron. The union of workers and their struggle played a part in the raising of wages. The standard of living, too, was not fixed, but fluctuated, due to the changing social conditions; the efforts of workers to adapt their way of living to the period they lived in; and the need of employers to adapt the living standards of the workers to enable the speed and efficiency of industry to be maintained or increased.

The really vital factor in overcrowding the labour market was not the birth-rate, but the use of machinery by the employers. The critics of Marx seem to get their knowledge of him from his opponents.

A. K.

CANADIAN NOTES.

A correspondent from Winnipeg, Canada, commenting on the situation there, says that everybody is talking wheat! wheat! The Canadian Wheat Pool was to save the farmers, but the bankers are forcing them to sell their wheat at a very low price, with the result that the pool is being broken and wheat is being "bootlegged" at market prices. The merchants cannot collect the farmers' bills, so have to cart away wheat to satisfy the debts.

Unemployment is rife in Canada, and the Reform Parties, I.L.P. and Communist, are vying with each other in their reform programmes. The old Socialist Party of Canada is dead, and its leading members, such as Harrington Lefaux and Pritchard, now support the I.L.P. candidates. Efforts are being made in Alberta to revive the S.P. of C., but it is not very promising at present. In Manitoba the One Big Union holds meetings, but as the Union contains all varieties of opinion, the need for Socialist educational work is great. Amongst the

thousands of members the One Big Union contains, there are no subscribers of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, our correspondent informs us. In an area where this journal had a good circulation, the few readers to-day indicates how little interest there is in real Socialist work. There is no paper in the U.S.A. and Canada to compare with the educational value of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD, and we urge our friends there to make it widely known.

C.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Owing to pressure on our space, replies to several correspondents have been crowded out of this issue. They will appear next month.

ED. COMM.

Fill in and post to 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E. 1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me the "Socialist Standard" for 12 months, for which I enclose 2/6.

Name

Address

Date

(If required only for 6 months, send 1/3).

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Sunday ... | Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.45 a.m.
Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m.
Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 7.30 p.m. |
| Monday ... | Ridley Road, Hackney, 8 p.m. |
| Wednesday ... | Stepney Green, 8 p.m.
Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Thane Villas, Hornsey Road, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 8 p.m. |
| Thursday ... | Tottenham Road, Kingsland Road, 8 p.m. |
| Friday ... | Prince of Wales, Harrow Road, 8 p.m.
Battersea, Mossbury Road, 8.15 p.m. |
| Saturday ... | Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.
Brentford High Street, 8 p.m. |

MANCHESTER.

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| Sunday .. | Platt Park, 3 p.m.
Eccles Cross, 7 p.m. |
|------------------|--|

EDINBURGH.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Wednesdays ... | The Mound, 8 p.m. |
| Fridays ... | |
| Saturdays ... | |
| Sundays ... | The Mound, 7 p.m. |

GLASGOW DISTRICT.

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sundays ... | West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m. |
| Thursdays ... | Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m. |

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

- BATTERSEA**.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.
- BECONTREE**.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.
- BIRMINGHAM**.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.
- CENTRAL**.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.
- EAST LONDON**.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.
- GLASGOW**.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.
- HACKNEY**.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Fridays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication on to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.
- HULL**.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month at 213 Beverly Road. Communications to M. V. Coupland at above address.
- ISLINGTON**.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.
- LEYTON**.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.
- MANCHESTER**.—Sec., W. Addison, 19, Craigwell Road, Park Road, Heaton Park. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month at 8.15 p.m. at Room 2, 183 Oxford Road, All Saints.
- PADDINGTON**.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).
- SHEFFIELD**.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 44, Edgedale Road.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA**.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Welling-ton-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.
- SOUTHWARK**.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.
- TOOTING**.—Branch meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursday in the month at the Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17. Sec. (pro-tem), H. E. Hutchins, 174, Haydon's Road, South Wimbledon, S.W. 19.
- TOTTENHAM**.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW**.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.
- WATFORD**.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.
- WEST HAM**.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec. F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N. 8. Branch meets 2nd 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m. at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 315. Vol. 27.]

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION

Our readers will be familiar with the Socialist Party's attitude towards the "Labour and Socialist International," which is a loose association of parties like the Labour Party and the I.L.P., and towards the "Third (Communist) International." We are hostile to the national parties on account of their failure to accept and apply the principles of Socialism, and equally hostile to the international federations which cannot be more advanced than the affiliated organisations themselves.

The "Labour and Socialist International" is composed of parties which are prepared to support the capitalist class in their wars, and are prepared either alone or in coalition with Liberals and Tories, to carry on the administration of the capitalist system.

The "Third International" differs from its rival in several important respects, but its aims and methods are no less dangerous to the working class. It is rigidly centralised, but the control of the organisation is not in the hands of the affiliated parties. These latter are in the position of having their policies dictated to them by the Russian party. The policies are in line with the wishes of the Russian government, but not necessarily in line with working-class interests. So we see the Communists advocating the dangerous tactic of violence and giving support to capitalist parties (e.g., the Labour Party). The Socialist movement is not helped, but hindered, by such methods.

It is an encouraging sign that there are now quite a number of parties abroad whose experiences during and since the war have taught them that neither of the international federations is deserving of the support of Socialists. While such an attitude is not of itself proof of sound Socialist

principles, it is full of promise for the future. An attempt has been made by some of these parties to lay the foundation for **THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST PARTIES.**

The International Bureau has affiliated to it parties in France, Germany, Italy, Rumania, Russia, and Jugo-Slavia. In addition, a Norwegian party endorses its attitude towards the existing internationals. Reports of the Bureau's Congresses show that, for most of the delegates, association with either of these bodies is unthinkable, and it is claimed by the Secretary of the Bureau, Angelica Balabanoff, that the constituent parties, "at least the majority," are Marxist. It is important to notice, however, that the Bureau has no formal constitution. That being so, it is difficult to see how the International Bureau can take the very necessary steps to see that its affiliated bodies are parties which conform to the essentials of Socialist principles and policy. We read, for example, that Maxton and Brockway, of the I.L.P., have indicated their "interest and sympathy." If the Bureau had a formal constitution based on Marxian principles, these two advocates of alliance with the parties of capitalism would have known that they could not give support to it.

In the absence of such a constitution, the soundness of the organisation can only be tested by an examination of its affiliated parties. The principles of one of them, the French party, are examined below.

THE SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE.

The Socialist-Communist Party was formed in 1922 by members of the Communist Party who found intolerable the way in which the Moscow organisation habitually ignored and countermanded the

decisions arrived at by the Congresses of the French party, especially in view of the fact that Moscow's orders were not of a kind to further the interests of the working class. The new organisation at its Congress in 1923 adopted the following declaration as a basis of "reconstituting the unity of the working class":—

The formation of a class political party for the revolutionary conquest of power by the workers, with a view to securing, by means of a temporary and impersonal dictatorship of the whole working class, the disappearance of the State and the substitution of socialism or communism for capitalism. The utilisation of all means for ameliorating the workers' conditions of life; the refusal to vote for capitalist budgets and refusal to participate in the government of capitalism; opposition to war making, accepting the principle of "insurrection rather than war."

The party's attitude to political action is rather obscure. It repudiates the Communist policy of a violent seizure of power by a minority, and it takes part in national and local elections, but "without attaching to elections exceptional importance . . . attributing to them chiefly a propaganda value."

The Socialist-Communist Party's views on many questions are set out in a pamphlet, "L'Unité Ouvrière Nationale et Internationale" (Working Class Unity, National and International), written by the General Secretary, Paul Louis, and published by the party at 12, Rue Rochambeau, Paris 9.

The main argument of the pamphlet is that, were the working class re-united, Socialism would be obtainable. Unity is to be achieved largely through the instrumentality of an international organisation. The writer, Paul Louis, entirely overlooks the point, which is of the utmost importance, that the working class have never yet been united in any country on a Socialist programme. If they had, the existing divisions could never have arisen.

He makes the serious mistake of supposing that the British Labour Party and the I.L.P. are parties of Marxians. Let us therefore repeat that the Labour Party in this country has never at any time had Socialism as its objective. Its aim has been, and is, some form or other of nationalisation or State capitalism. The Labour Party and the I.L.P. have never even claimed to be Marxian bodies, in which respect they are superficially unlike the Labour Parties in the Continental countries

which have made that claim. The difference is, however, one of appearances only. Neither in France nor Germany has the nominal acceptance of Marxian principles meant the application of those principles to policy. The behaviour of the German and French parties in 1914 sufficiently demonstrated that.

When, therefore, Paul Louis writes of "re-uniting" the working class, he is overlooking the fact that the working class have not been won over to Socialism in any country. The majority of them do not want Socialism and do not understand it. That being so, it is mere illusion to imagine that working-class unity on a Socialist basis is attainable at present. A Socialist Party cannot yet be more than a minority party.

Paul Louis is similarly mistaken when he writes of the International having broken down only in 1914.

The International had not been built up on a Socialist basis, as was shown before 1914 by its admission to membership of such parties as the Labour Party, the I.L.P., and the French and German Parties, none of which were based on Socialist principles and policy. The anti-Socialist character of the International was perceived by the Socialist Party of Great Britain long before 1914. We foretold that it would be as useless in war as in peace, and we withdrew long before the outbreak of war proved the correctness of our condemnation.

Paul Louis may say that it is not that kind of unity which his party seeks to re-constitute. But if that is the case, then it is essential that each national party and the International itself should be firmly based upon a clear declaration of essential Socialist principles. The objective of common or social ownership must be clearly understood (this alone would rule out the parties now in the Labour and Socialist International, all of which are supporters of nationalisation or State capitalism).

There must be no room for policies of minority action and armed revolt.

There must be no collaboration with capitalist parties. (This would rule out not only the Labour Party and the I.L.P., both of which are prepared to co-operate with Liberals and Tories in the administration of capitalism, but would also rule out the Communist Parties, which for years have

urged the workers to vote for the Labour Parties.)

There must be no room in a Socialist International for any but Socialist parties. And this being so, there could be no purpose in forming an international organisation except upon a definitely constituted Socialist basis. If the affiliated parties are Socialist parties then they can and will undertake to conform to Socialist principles.

The work of making Socialists has to precede the growth of the separate Socialist parties, and their construction on a sound basis must precede the formation of an effective international.

If Paul Louis envisages the reverse process, he has failed to read aright the lessons of past attempts at building national and international Socialist organisations.

We would welcome some further information on the aims and methods of the French Socialist-Communist Party.

First we would like to know exactly what is its objective. It ought, of course, to be unnecessary to ask such a question of a party which declares its aim to be Socialism and declares its acceptance of Marxian theories. Unfortunately, the Labour Parties in all countries have misused the word Socialism, and applied it to their aim of state capitalism, which leaves intact the division of society into a propertied class and a class of property-less wage-earners.

Secondly, we would like to know exactly where the Socialist-Communist Party stands with regard to the use of the vote. If, as appears to be the case, they regard elections as having chiefly a propaganda value, how do they propose to gain control of the political machinery, without which Socialism cannot be achieved?

Thirdly, does the Socialist-Communist Party rule out entirely the policy of collaboration with the non-Socialist parties, including the parties in the Labour and Socialist International and the parties in the Third International?

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is not prepared to join with parties whose aims and methods are contrary to the interests of the working class and a hindrance to the achievement of Socialism. The Labour and Communist Parties are parties to which that condemnation applies. It is our experience that any other policy is fatal for a Socialist organisation.

H.

MARX, LENIN, AND INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM.

Armley, Leeds.

Dear Comrades,

In your review of Clausen's book in June S.S. you state that Clausen does not show how the economic organisation can "take and hold"; nor did De Leon. How did De Leon come to epitomize that statement which you point out Marx never made about the economic organisation, as being "typically Marxian"? (p. 37 "Industrial Unionism").

In "The Revolutionary Act" Engels says (p. 20) "History has proved us wrong," and advocated political supremacy rather than armed insurrection.

He also says, "The irony of history turns everything upside down."

This implies change of opinion, and if Engels could change from advocating barricade tactics to that of the ballot, might he not change his opinion again if alive to-day, and give same countenance to Industrial organisation?

Did De Leon "forge" the "link" between Marx and Engels and present Industrial development?

The backwardness of Russian Industrial development precluded Lenin from applying Industrial Unionism, which, it is reported he said was "the Basic thing," and that "De Leon first formulated the idea of a Soviet Government which grew from his idea."

Will you please give your opinion as to why Lenin thought Industrial Unionism was the "Basic thing"?

Yours fraternally,

H. SCOTT.

MARX VERSUS DIRECT ACTION.

The above letter illustrates how easily critics dodge the question at issue. Neither our critic nor De Leon, nor anybody else, has been able to show that Marx held that the workers could only win possession by economic action. We have once again to remind critics that Marx's essential point was that the workers must first of all win political supremacy. Both Marx and Engels waged continuous war against Bakunin, who advocated economic action as the only way.

DE LEON'S GYMNASTICS.

Daniel De Leon, however, held quite a number of conflicting ideas as to the nature of the Marxian method. De Leon's and the S.L.P.'s first economic child—the Socialist Trade and Labour Alliance—laid it down in their Declaration of Principles that "the economic power of the capitalist class, used by that class for the oppression of labour, rests upon institutions essentially political."

Explaining the policy of that body, De

Leon in "What Means this Strike" declared:—

Shop organisation alone, unbacked by that political force that threatens the capitalist class with extinction, the working-class being the overwhelming majority, leaves the workers wholly unprotected.

In his "Two Pages from Roman History," De Leon said:—

Obviously, independent class conscious action is the head of Labour's lance. Useful as any other weapon may be, that weapon is the determining factor.

Entrenched in the public powers, the capitalist class command the field. *None but the political weapon can dislodge the usurpers and enthrone the working-class; that is to say, emancipate the workers and rear the Socialist Republic.* (Italics ours.)

When, however, De Leon and Co.'s next economic child was born he discovered another alleged "typically Marxian" position which is completely opposed to the statements just quoted. The Industrial Workers of the World, formed in 1905, had a platform which stated that the taking and holding of the means of life must be done by an economic organisation without affiliation to any political party.

De Leon, in his address "The Preamble of the I.W.W.," said:—

It does not lie in a political organisation, that is, a party, "to take and hold" the machinery of production;

And he tells us in the same work:—

In the act, however, of taking and holding the nation's plants of production the political organisation of the working-class can give no help.

The anti-political views of De Leon were made clear at the first convention of the I.W.W. in his speech:—

The situation in America . . . establishes the fact that "the taking and holding" of the things that labour needs to be free can never depend upon a political party. If anything is clear in the American situation it is this: That if any individual is elected to office upon a revolutionary ballot, that individual is a suspicious character. Whoever is returned elected upon a programme of labour emancipation; whoever is allowed to be filtered through the political inspectors of the capitalist class: that man is a carefully selected tool, a traitor to the working people, selected by the capitalist class. (Report, p. 226.)

A favourite phrase of De Leon's was that the day of political victory was the day of defeat unless the workers had the economic might to enforce their political victory.

DE LEON AND MARX.

Our critic asks if De Leon forged a link between Marx and Engels and present industrial development.

If, as our critic claims, De Leon's position was "typically Marxian," why forge a link to put it right? Modern industrial development has shown the overwhelming importance of political power and the weakness of the workers on the economic field. Riddles such as what opinions Engels would hold if he were alive to-day may provide amusement but it is for our critic and those agreeing with him to show that the views of Engels in 1895 (See "Class Struggles in France") are out-of-date to-day.

WHY CHASE THE SHADOW?

The S.L.P. position led logically to Anarchism, for if politics was a shadow and a reflex only, as they claimed, and if the real power lay on the industrial field, why bother with shadows, and why not go in for the substance of economic action? And that is what happened. The Industrial Workers of the World took De Leon at his word and concentrated on industrial organisation.

Then De Leon and the S.L.P. gave birth to a third economic child (in 1908) made up of the minority of the I.W.W., which was called the Workers' International Industrial Union, but after a flicker of life it went the same way. Like all industrial organisations it was compelled to enrol workers of all political opinions, and so the members who were united industrially were fighting each other politically.

After its organisers, etc., had supported the freak parties called Socialist, the Industrial Union refused to endorse its parent—the S.L.P., and the third economic child was buried quietly by the S.L.P.

LENIN THE NEXT WITNESS.

Our correspondent asks why did Lenin say that Industrial Unionism is the basic thing?

The only information on the point is the reference by two journalists to Lenin's remark to them about De Leon after he had seen some of De Leon's writings in 1919. Did Lenin make use of or actually support Industrial Unionism? There is not a scrap of evidence to prove that. The Socialist Labour Party pointed out that the workers of Russia were not organised in industrial unions and their National Secretary, Arnold Peterson, after pointing that out, concluded in the following words: "So long as the Bolsheviks were in opposition it was doing excellent agitational work. Now that it is in power it faces

failure. The day of its victory was the day of its defeat." (*Weekly People*, Nov. 24th, 1917.)

The "basic thing" that Lenin referred to was the organization by industry instead of by territory. Nowhere did Lenin support the chief idea of the Industrial Unionists that they could take and hold by economic means alone, and nowhere did he embody it in Third International policy.

On the contrary, in his "Open letter to the I.W.W.," Lenin attacks their Anarchist idea of relying upon economic action.

In actual practice Russia's government was not an industrial government chosen from the industries but simply an ordinary party government—that of the Communist Party.

Lenin and the Third International advocated many policies from open violence and insurrection to support of a Labour government. From minority action to going with the "Labour" masses. Certainly industrial unionism was not one of them. Lenin found that Russian workers organised in trades and economic bodies were using their organisation in hostility to the wider interests of society as a whole (see "Soviets at Work" and Phillips Price "Capitalist Europe v. Soviet Russia"), and he had to curb their narrow industrial actions.

Soviets or councils were old in the history of Russia and did not need De Leon or Lenin to invent them.

Lenin had to teach the same lesson that Marx taught, that the control of the State power was the essential thing. So neither Marx nor Lenin nor Engels assists our critic in his support of industrial unionism.

Why do our critics not attempt to show how unionism of any kind is the might that can take and hold the means of life?

A. KOHN.

MEETINGS. EAST-LONDON.

BANCROFT ROAD LIBRARY,
:: LECTURE HALL ::

THURSDAY EVENINGS 8 P.M. PROMPT.

LIST OF DONATIONS TO PARTY FUNDS.

Ilford Reader 1s.; A. R. Snelgrove 16s. 6d.; C. Barnes £1; Conference £3 1s.; Conference £4 1s. 2d.; Battersea 5s.; F.C. 2s. 6d.; W. Dennis 1s.; Rosetti 3s.; Box 1s. 11d.; G.R. 2s. 6d.; A.A.F. 2s. 6d.; A.B.T. 2s. 6d.; A.H.S. £1; J. Spark 2s. 6d.; Ilford Reader 1s. 6d.; B. Woan 7s. 6d.; A.E.H. 16s.; Hull Branch £1 7s. 6d.; Walsh 2s.; G. Watson 7s. 6d.; F. Smith 10s.; R. Styles 5d.; Bins 1s. 5d.; Zip 9d.; Leyton 5s.; R.F. 1s.; W. Sorby 2s. 6d.; W.S.B. 2s. 6d.; G.C.C. 3s.; J.H.H. 13s. 6d.; Wyatt 7d.; H.G. 3s.; W.C. 10s.; G.G. 7s. 6d.; A.W. 2s. 4d.; R.F. 1s.; Miss H. £2 16s.; W.Q. 2s.; C.D.G. £2 3s. 8d.; R.B. 2s. 6d.; W.S. 5s.; M.F. 1s.; H 3s.; H.W.P. 9d.; G.C.R. 3s.; W.N. 1s.; Mim 2s. 6d.; J.C. 2s.; R.W.H. 1s. 6d.; A.H.S. £1; W.A.S. £1; Hoff 2s.; Bam 1s. 2d.; E.H. £1; G.E.S. 1s.; Hatt 5s.; Snel £1; Tess £1; J.C. 1s. 6d.; G.C.G. 1s.; Mim 2s. 6d.; W.C. 5s.; E.H. 6d.; R.F. 1s.; J.B. 1s.; J.C. 1s.; F.L.H. £1; V.W. 2s. 6d.; F.F. 10s.; A.F.F. 2s. 6d.; G.C.G. 3s.; A.T.M. 6d.; W.H. 10s.; E.P. 3s. 6d.; R.F. 1s.; W.H. 2s.; T.B. 17s. 6d.; A.M. 2s. 6d.; R.F. 1s.; F.R.B. 5s.; Collected at Head Office £8 5s. 3d.; H. Brooks 8s.; R. 10s.; West Ham Branch 11s.; Per Com. Jones 4s.; Per Com. Curtis 1s. 9d.; Total £44 4s. 8d.

Donations should be sent to Treasurer, S.P.G.B., 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1.

When you have read the "Socialist Standard" pass it on to a friend—he may become a Subscriber.

"THE PROLETARIAN" (U.S.A.).

A criticism in the "Proletarian" (October) will be replied to in our next issue.

BATTERSEA An Indoor Meeting

will be held in the
WAITING ROOM,
LATCHMERE ROAD BATHS
on
November 20th, at 8.30 p.m.
Speaker - - - W. MACHAFFIE.

Subject—
"STATE AND REVOLUTION."
Questions and Discussion.

RAMSAY MACDONALD AND THE "GREAT WAR."

The pacificism of MacDonald has almost become a legend—to those who know little about him. The picture of him as a man of peace is rudely dispelled at the moment by his action as Prime Minister in deciding to build more ships than the Tories—as his own supporter, Kenworthy, has shown, and the programme of more bombing planes which his Air Ministry has put through.

Our Party Manifesto reprints MacDonald's famous letter to the Mayor of Leicester during the war, in which our "pacific" Prime Minister called the young men of England to their "patriotic duty."

In the life and work of MacDonald written by his admirer and defender, H. H. Tiltman, we have more evidence showing how MacDonald tried to keep the appearance of a pacifist whilst supporting the war.

On the economic causes of the war he was silent. He said nothing about the economic aims of the ruling class of each country pursuing the war. The only attack he made was on the diplomatic methods of the war mongers, especially the secret diplomacy of Sir Edward Grey. That was why MacDonald was criticised.

The day war was declared MacDonald merely showed that he did not believe that "national interests" were at stake.

I want to say to this House, and to say it without equivocation, if the right hon. Gentleman had come here to-day and told us that our country is in danger, I do not care what party he appealed to, or to what class he appealed, we would be with him and behind him. If this is so, we will vote him what money he wants. Yes, and we will go further. We will offer him ourselves if the country is in danger.

(House of Commons, 3rd August, 1914. quoted p. 285.)

Four days afterwards he followed that speech by another in the Trades Hall, Leicester (August 7th, 1914).

We are in it and we must see it through. It is a sad thing that we, loving our own country best, and hoping and striving that we shall not be defeated or worsened or disgraced, should have as counterpart to that the desire that this great nation of Germany should be worsened, defeated, and disgraced. How one almost hates the diplomacy that has brought us to this.

(Quoted Tiltman, p. 93.)

After such a statement it is quite natural that his biographer should say:—

The war, once begun, however, he never cast any reflection upon the need of pursuing it

up to a point at which a peace, just to this country, France, Belgium and Germany alike, was obtainable. (p. 94.)

The Labour Party threw their entire resources into the war. Henderson, Clynes, Parker, Roberts, etc., became members of the war Government. Did MacDonald resign from the Party? Or was he relieved of his position?

No, he retained his official position, as Mr. Tiltman shows:—

During this time, when even those who admitted that they knew Ramsay MacDonald could not escape a measure of social ostracism, he retained his official connection with the Labour Party as the Treasurer of the body which he had fashioned in its earliest days.

(p. 103.)

At Oldham on October 28th, 1916, MacDonald made a speech full of the usual rhetoric indulged in by recruiters. We quote an extract:—

When a nation was threatened something instinctive in every man and woman in the nation made them stand by their nation. England was not merely a little patch of red on a map of the world, but it was something like a personnel, that had grown through generations and centuries, so that the English man or woman was something that had a rich past, a hopeful present and an enticing future. All these things came into the minds of the people at the moment of war and made them forget all differences and principles and fight, almost blindly, for national existence and nationality itself. That was the instinctive emotion of the moment.

(p. 109.)

In the House of Commons, as late as June 20th, 1918, MacDonald was still "in the war":

I am in the war for the purpose of ending all war. Because that is so, I say you will have to adopt a method which the history of Europe shows has never been adopted before, because if you go on the old lines you will fulfil the old ends and nothing else. Therefore, I appeal to the Government to bring freshness of mind to these problems of diplomacy.

(Quoted p. 114.)

H. G. Wells, the war supporter, said that it was a war to end war. Ramsay MacDonald followed him very close in this moonshine:—

With our hearts uplifted and our enemies' minds enlightened, I am perfectly certain that this war will eventuate in a demand for peace which will not be broken again—a demand for a peace which will be established upon the common agreements of the peoples, and which, therefore, will never be assailed in the history of mankind.

(House of Commons, May 24th, 1916; quoted p. 109.)

When MacDonald expressed a desire for

bringing the war to a close soon it was because he wanted to see "us" get the best terms.

Listen to his speech at Swansea in May, 1917:—

The country is threatened by two dangers. The first is that it may make peace on account of war weariness. Nothing can be more fatal than that peace should be made because this country is war weary. That means that you will not obtain your object at all. A man who runs a race to obtain a prize, and who sits down on the course half-way to the goal, has not only lost, but has lost very badly. This country must not be allowed to make peace on account of war weariness.

(Quoted Tiltman, p. 112.)

When murmurs arose in his own I.L.P. against their "comrades" who were a part of the war Government, MacDonald set out to allay these protests by reminding them of the necessity of unity with the super-patriots after the war. Tiltman quotes an incident:—

The Town Hall in Newcastle was crowded with delegates of the I.L.P. Annual Conference in 1916. Members of the Party who favoured a strong war policy were obviously in a minority. Delegate after delegate rose and literally shouted for the heads of Henderson, Barnes, Clynes and Parker. . . . MacDonald rose, quiet and grave, and in the measured accents of the Scot, and with relentless logic, envisioned the future when the temporary issue of the war had passed and the need for unity would be greater than ever before. "Be fair to these men, even though you don't see eye to eye with them," was the gist of the speech.

(p. 101.)

A final quotation from the biography will be useful to portray this pacific war supporter as his apologist sees him:—

Within the last twelve months a Member of Parliament who sat in the House of Commons throughout the war has informed me that MacDonald was in a state of indecision for weeks following the outbreak of hostilities, and he instanced this recruiting letter as evidence of the fact. Perhaps he had not examined Mr. MacDonald's speeches at that time. Through them all runs the same clear-cut policy of opposition to our foreign policy, and acceptance of the fact that once the war had started it must be waged until a just peace was possible.

(p. 96.)

All the copies of speeches, etc., quoted, were provided by MacDonald to assist in preparing the book, so that there can be no question of their genuineness.

To aspiring youths now doing odd jobs in the workshop of Labourism, this biography should be useful to teach them how to become a "Statesman!"

WHO OWNS "OUR" COUNTRY? RUNCIMAN ANSWERED.

Periodically, Mr. Walter Runciman and the Economic League compile impressive-looking figures of the total amount saved by workers and other small investors and deposited in the Post Office Savings Banks, Building Societies, Registered Provident Societies, etc. On the basis of this, the Economic League coined a slogan, "Every man a capitalist." The total amount looks considerable until it is remembered how many people there are among whom the ownership of it is divided. The true position has now been analysed and explained by Mr. Hargreaves Parkinson, of *The Economist*, in his book, "The Small Investor" (Blackie & Son, Ltd., 4s.). He points out in Chapter XIII that the total amount of savings in all kinds of institutions, and including an estimate of the amount of small investments in Stock Exchange securities, represents only from 10 per cent. to 14 per cent. of the total wealth of Great Britain.

This means that over 75 per cent. of the population own between them only from one-tenth to one-seventh of the total wealth. The remaining 86 per cent. to 90 per cent. of the national wealth is the private property of less than one-quarter of the population (see pages 108-110).

It may also be remarked that Mr. Parkinson's estimate of the amount of small investors' savings errs decidedly on the liberal side. He assumes, for example, that the £290 millions in the Post Office Savings Banks and the £130 millions in the Trustee Savings Banks belong wholly to small depositors, whereas investigation has shown that to a very large extent these totals are the property of a few relatively large depositors.

However, his conclusions are sufficient to show that Mr. Runciman's figures prove the exact opposite of what he contends. They illustrate not that there is a high degree of equality, but that there is a staggering inequality as between the 25 per cent. of wealthy persons and their families, and the 75 per cent. who make up the rest of the population. H.

**YOUR Newsagent can obtain this
Journal from W. H. Smith & Son,
Strand House, W.C.**

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free.. .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

NOV.,

1930

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT AND SOCIALISM.**WHO ARE THE "IMPOSSIBLISTS"?**

It has been an argument of long standing among Labour Party supporters that the activities of their party, even if not directly concerned with Socialism, are justified because they are leading towards it. They have ridiculed our policy of working directly for Socialism as "impossiblism."

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald repeated this justification for the Labour Party at its Conference held at Llandudno in October. He said:—

The Government's pledges were those of Socialists convinced that the capitalist system cannot be made to work. If his opponents objected that the Government had not reached the Socialist goal, he answered, "No, we haven't, but we are going to get there."
(*News-Chronicle*, 8th October.)

Mr. MacDonald's statement is hardly compatible with Mr. J. H. Thomas's admission at the Conference of the National Union of Railwaymen on 5th July, 1929, that the Government proposed to tackle the unemployment problem while "accepting the present order of society."

Nor does it fit in with the significant fact that the Liberals put the Labour Government into office, keep them there, and are carrying on friendly secret discussions with

them. Are we to believe that Mr. Lloyd George and his party would support a Government which is going towards Socialism?

A direct negative to Mr. MacDonald's claim has been made by one of the members of the Labour Government, the Earl de la Warr, who is Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture.

Speaking at Crewe on October 12th, to a meeting of farmers and landowners, he dealt with the plea that the Labour Government is "going to get" to Socialism. He said:—

The first criticism of the [Labour Government's] Marketing Bill . . . was that it was a step to Socialism and involved nationalisation of the land. . . "Really," said the Earl, "I must confess that for sheer drivelling nonsense and attempted appeal to prejudice I have never read the like of this."

(*Daily Herald*, 13th October.)

MR. MORRISON'S "CAPITALISTIC SOVIET."

Then there is Mr. Herbert Morrison, Minister of Transport. Under his London Traffic Scheme the railways, buses, tubes, and trams are going to be placed under the control of a statutory public body. The organisation is to be managed by

a small board consisting of persons of proved business capacity . . . such as would command the confidence both of the investing public and of the users of transport in London . . . Such a board should function as freely as possible from political interference.

(*Daily Telegraph*, 3rd October.)

The shareholders are, of course, to be given shares in the new organisation, in place of their present shares; they are to lose nothing.

The official statement from which the above extracts are taken, was issued by Mr. Morrison, and in it he justifies his scheme by referring to the precedent of the Port of London Authority.

It is not so long ago that Mr. Herbert Morrison explained just what sort of thing the Port of London Authority is. In a letter to the *Daily Herald* on July 30th, 1923, he protested against Labour supporters showing approval of the P.L.A. He wrote:—

The Port of London Authority was established by Mr. Lloyd George some years ago to enable the capitalists of the Port to have the advantages of public credit and to do for themselves collectively what they and a number of private companies had been unable to do with success individually. . . . The Port of London

Authority is a capitalistic Soviet . . . the constitution of which is thoroughly objectionable from the Labour and Socialist point of view, and which has certainly not been as friendly to the workers of the Port of London as it might have been.

In face of the actual legislation carried out and proposed by the Labour Government, it is difficult to understand how its members can still believe that they are moving towards Socialism. Once in office they have found, as we foretold, that the capitalist system cannot be run except upon principles which, save in matters of detail, are the same as those which guided the Conservatives and Liberals when they were in office. To retain capitalism is a practicable policy, although an unsatisfactory one from a working class standpoint. To abolish capitalism and establish Socialism will be practicable as soon as the working class have been won over to Socialism. The Labour Party has sought to justify a third policy, which is that of trying to abolish the evils of capitalism while keeping the system itself. Events are proving that the task is an impossible one.

ANOTHER STEP FORWARD.

Ten years before the war recorded in blood the true nature of the present social system, a small but determined body of workers met in London and founded the Socialist Party of Great Britain, and set themselves the task of waging an uncompromising fight for the overthrow of the present order of society, and the establishment of Socialism.

Their action in throwing down the gauntlet to the mighty forces of confusion which stood as a bulwark in defence of capitalism, appeared to many to be little short of madness.

True! the task to which these pioneers set their hands was a formidable one, but they drew strength from the knowledge that however great were the resources at the command of their enemies, the development of the present system would slowly but surely work to the advantage of the Socialist movement.

This knowledge encouraged them to go forward, but did not blind them to the fact that they had undertaken a task which would test the endurance and consistency of the strongest. The experience of the party

bears this out. Difficulties too numerous to mention have been met and overcome. Time after time have the members been called together to deal with a pressing situation, and on each occasion the trouble has been boldly faced and effectively dealt with; but not without the sacrifice of time, energy and money which members often could ill afford.

An item of expense that has given us many anxious moments and opened many slender purses, has been the publication of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. It is because it was recognised that the regular appearance of our official organ was of such vital importance to the movement, that no effort to keep it going was spared.

In the fight for Socialism the STANDARD has been one of our most effective means of propaganda. It has enabled us to deliver our message not only in this country, but in all parts of the English speaking world.

The need for the STANDARD and its possibilities are now greater than ever. Owing to the rapid industrial developments of the past few years the minds of thousands of workers are in a state of unrest, and need but an understanding of the principles of Socialism to convert their aimless discontent into a state of ordered enlightenment, and so add their strength to the revolutionary movement.

Unfortunately, our powers of propaganda are limited, the circulation of this Journal is not as large as it might be, and the expense of its publication is still a drain upon the general funds of the Party. But there is the possibility of making the STANDARD self-supporting. A thousand new readers will accomplish this object, and that secured, progress will be easier and more rapid.

The question was discussed at a meeting of members, and it was decided to make a special effort to secure an increase in our circulation. Members feel confident that, with the assistance of all our sympathisers, the effort will be successful. We are, therefore, putting a simple question to you.

* * *

WILL YOU HELP?

In the first place, do you receive a copy of the SOCIALIST STANDARD regularly every month? If not, we urge you to fill in the

subscription form printed elsewhere in this issue, and so ensure a regular supply in future.

It is certain that among your friends and workmates there are a few who would appreciate the STANDARD. Why not endeavour to get them to subscribe?

Many of our members sell the STANDARD at the branch meetings of their trade unions. If you are able to do this, let us know and we will forward to you, post free, the number you require, no matter how small.

Perhaps a few specimen copies will be useful to you in your endeavour to help us? If so, let us know the number you can distribute to advantage and we will send them along.

Another way you can help is by purchasing an extra copy of the STANDARD each month and passing it on to a likely reader.

Do you know of any group of workers or a discussion circle that would be interested in our literature? If so, let us have their name and address.

We are always glad to hear from our sympathisers, and invite you to let us know what success attends your efforts and the difficulties you encounter.

Now let us impress this fact upon you. A thousand new readers will put the STANDARD on a sound financial footing, and will lead the way to a still wider circulation. This, in turn, will lead to an increase in our membership, which will enable us to extend our activities in other directions, and so the movement will gain momentum.

Sunday Evening Meetings. Head Office.

Date.	Subject.	Speaker.
November 2nd	B. Carthurs
	'Riches and Poverty.'	
November 9th	E. Hoare
	'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.'	
November 16th	W. Miles
	'Socialist Principles.'	
November 23rd	R. Ambridge
	'Freedom and the Working Class.'	
November 30th	J. Strickett
	'Ourselves and Others.'	

Meetings commence at 8 p.m.
Discussion and Question.

All invited.
Admission Free.

SPIRITUALISM.

In the September issue we published a letter from a reader, in which he related his experiences at a spiritist meeting, and the deep impression which they made upon him. Our reply in the same issue, while it has not elicited any further letter from the original inquirer, has led to several other readers writing to express their views. It is impossible, owing to their length, to print these letters in full, but we have tried below to deal with the points raised in them.

First, let us deal again with the experience of the reader whose letter we published. He went to a spiritualist meeting, and believes that he was "a perfect stranger" to those present. He was told certain facts about a dead relative of his, and was also told that he was suffering from a complaint which "is not visible to anyone except when nude."

We replied that the facts related by our reader do not in any way help to establish the belief in the existence of so-called "spirit forces." As our reply is unconvincing to some correspondents, and has been misunderstood by others, some amplification may be desirable.

Spiritualists claim firstly that certain phenomena cannot be explained by known natural laws. They claim secondly that the existence of "spirit forces" is the explanation.

It is important to observe that these are two quite distinct propositions; if the first were proved true, it by no means follows that the second is likewise true. The phenomena, if such phenomena exist, might not be explicable by existing known natural laws, but, nevertheless, explicable by hitherto unknown but still natural laws.

Now let us return to our correspondent's letter. Does he present us with convincing evidence of inexplicable phenomena? The answer is emphatically no! He suffers from a disease which is "not visible to anyone except when nude"; but every doctor is taught by one or other of the systems of diagnosis to recognise symptoms of disease in the face, the hands, the eyes, etc. Does a doctor have to see a man's kidneys before he can suspect the existence of a disease of that organ? Our reader does not mention this, and apparently did not even consider it, yet we are asked on

the strength of it to believe in "spiritualism"!

His second point was that he, "a perfect stranger," was told certain things about his dead aunt. But how does he know that he was "a perfect stranger"? He may not have recognised any of those whom he saw present, but that is no indication that someone there did not know certain facts about him and his dead relative.

In short, this particular incident does not contain any phenomena which require us to inquire into the adequacy or inadequacy of existing natural laws.

Then there is the second point, that even if this incident did contain unquestionable evidence of phenomena which known laws would not explain, it does not follow that "spiritualism" is the explanation. One hypothesis—suggested but not proved—is that of telepathy. Telepathy, if it were proved, would explain what our correspondent (without sufficient evidence) believes took place, but would not prove the claims of the spiritualists.

So much for that incident. Now for the claims of spiritualists in general, and of our other correspondents.

To all of these we would first point out that even Sir Oliver Lodge, although himself a spiritualist, admits that scientific proof of spiritualism is lacking. In an address delivered at the David Thomas Memorial Church, Bristol, on September 7th of this year, he said:—(*Times*, 8th September):—

... they held, in fact, the doctrine of individual survival, and adduced plenty of evidence in support of it. *Whether that evidence amounted to proof was still a matter of opinion.* Scientific proof was a serious thing, not lightly to be testified to; but the evidence was certainly very strong. (*Italics ours.*)

The fact that Sir Oliver Lodge believes in it without proof does not show that it deserves belief. It merely shows the fallibility of the scientist in matters where a strong emotion is at work.

One reader writes to tell us that "spiritualism is Socialism." In reply, we cannot do more than emphasise our continued teaching that Socialism is not a visionary's dream, but a system of society. Its basis will be in material conditions, the common ownership of the means of life. It will be brought about by men and women possessing knowledge of the world we live in, and able at least to glimpse at the

boundless possibilities of human development in a world of which the economic structure is rationally ordered. Progress to Socialism will not be promoted by those who give up the substance for the illusory benefits of life on the "other side." That is why the Socialist is compelled to touch upon questions of religion and spiritualism in order to drive home the lesson which is taught by past developments of man's powers, the lesson that the only safe rule is to accept no hypothesis as proved until it has been verified in accordance with scientific methods.

Most of the letters we have received on the subject have been to the point. One, from Mr. F. Montague, M.P., Under-Secretary for Air in the present Government, was mostly not to the point. In it we are charged with talking "ignorant rubbish," told not to play with words like "superstitious and supernatural" (we did not mention them), and informed that "to put it all down to cheap and clumsy fraud" puts us out of count as serious critics. If Mr. Montague had not been so angry he would have noticed that these and many other things he says have no bearing on the reply which he writes to criticise.

When he writes that spiritualism "must be proved or disproved of itself," we agree. But if he means to imply that it has been proved, we disagree. It certainly has not, and it is certainly true that an enormous amount of "cheap and clumsy fraud" has been associated with the activities of the spiritualists.

Mr. Montague says: "I know from my own mediumship of a number of years ago, that explanations of the conjuring and collusion order do not fill the bill."

Even on this point, notwithstanding Mr. Montague's personal experiences, we are not prepared to accept his statement, or any other such unsupported testimony as conclusive evidence. What Mr. Montague says he saw or thinks he knows is not proof. It is precisely because of the known credulousness or gullibility of the human mind that science demands proofs from which the possibility of human error is eliminated as far as possible. Such proofs have not been forthcoming from the spiritualists. If we may be permitted to illustrate this gullibility of the human mind by means of a reference to another field of activity, we would point out that Mr. Mon-

tague, in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, persists in adhering to the view that it is in the interests of the working class to have the Labour Party in office carrying on the capitalist system. Unfortunately, large numbers of workers believe this also.

In conclusion, we would refer interested correspondents to a full discussion on spiritualism which took place in the SOCIALIST STANDARD of the following months:—October and December, 1926; and March, May, June and August, 1927. These issues are obtainable from this office.

ED. COMM.

MINERS AND AIRMEN.

A CONTRAST IN TRAGEDIES.

The manner in which the R.101 eclipsed the Walsall miners provides an object lesson in the function of the capitalist press. The scandalous waste of miners' lives in the production of coal-owners profits makes a mine explosion a tit-bit of little value in the way of news. Of course, there is always "the Royal message of sympathy," and for two or three days "the disaster arouses the feeling of the whole community"—then it is quietly dropped. In this case, the dropping was rendered quick and certain by the occurrence of a first-rate space-filler.

It was not the immense risk they ran nor the horror of their deaths which made them heroes. Nor yet the fact that they were British. In these respects their case did not differ from that of the miners, for whom there was no military funeral, no flags flying half-mast, no ornate pomp and ceremony, to draw tens of thousands to see their coffins.

The R.101 was bound for Egypt and India. Its mission was professedly a peaceful one; but it belonged to an arm of the State which exists to destroy human lives whenever capitalist interests so dictate. Had the voyage proved a success its next trip might not have been so peaceful.

One journalistic defender of capitalism appeared to have an inkling that its working-class readers were not altogether blind to these facts. The *Daily Express* on October 11th, commented on the necessity for remembering the members of "that large industrial army who died in the performance of their duty."

Is it duty, then, that sends miners down the pit or the engineers and riggers up in the air? Listen to one of the survivors, Mr. Binks, of Sheffield. "Shall I fly again? Most certainly! *It is my living!*" And any miner would say the same. The workers the world over are driven to risk their lives in order to fill their stomachs and provide shelter for their skins. Their inspiration is not patriotism, but want; and this same want is the modern equivalent of the slave-driver's lash. By its aid are constructed edifices more mighty than the pyramids, more dreadful than Nero in their capacity for destruction.

To the British master-class the loss of the R.101 was more than mere material, for expensive experts shared the fate of their cheap subordinates. But as the present scribe is no expert, he does not intend to pronounce upon the hotly-debated question of lighter versus heavier-than-air-machines. Suffice it to point out that it is difficult to imagine the natives of tropical dependencies sharing their grief. Whether they are to be bombed from 'planes or gas-bags will, no doubt, appear in their eyes to be a matter of purely academic interest; and in the eyes of Socialists also. What is of the greatest importance is that the workers of the world should understand that it is not in *their* interests that these giant war-weapons are being developed. Empires and trade routes do not provide *them* with fortunes, and (apart from the relatives of the immediate victims) it is not they who have suffered a loss in this "national calamity"; but it is in the interests of the master-class that they should be led to think so. Hence the whole machinery for the manipulation of the "mass-mind" has been set in motion with a thoroughness reminiscent of 1914.

E. B.

CLASSES AT HEAD OFFICE.

The following classes are held at Head Office:

HISTORY. Monday evenings, 8 p.m.

ECONOMICS. Wednesday evenings, 8 p.m.

The classes are free and open to all. At the class on History each lecture will be complete in itself, and inability to attend regularly need not prevent students from attending when they are able.

CAN THE WORKERS UNDERSTAND SOCIALISM?

Is the working class a wash-out?—that is the question. A correspondent, in a very interesting letter, has put it this way. Socialism is a highly intellectual conception, and its acceptance involves a critical examination of the whole of one's ideas and beliefs. Now most people we meet are not highly intelligent, not critical, not very imaginative, and not even interested. Their conception of a better world is limited to the possibility of another pound a week in the present one. Sport and the daily newspaper give them all the romance they want. And yet, says our questioner, it is just these average, humdrum people who must be convinced that Socialism is both practicable and necessary. That is the poser.

If a recent lecturer on psychology is to be believed, the case is even worse. He said that just as physical growth slackens down at about the age of puberty, and shortly after ceases altogether, so does the intelligence slacken down and cease to develop at about the same age. After that, a person can acquire knowledge, but no more intelligence. It may be worth quoting his exact words:—

But with the average child, tests of innate intelligence show little appreciable improvement after the age of fourteen.

During the war, tests of intelligence were applied to nearly 2,000,000 recruits for the American Army; it was then discovered that the average mental age of adults in the United States was barely fourteen.

(Dr. Cyril Burt.)

This is rather staggering. Are you and I no more intelligent than our boys just leaving school? Are our apprentices, messengers and office boys to put us to shame and confusion by claiming intellectual equality? The eminent professor comes to our rescue, for he says:—

The paradox, however, may be easily explained away. The puzzle arises from confusing inborn or natural ability with acquired knowledge and attainments. The former ceases to improve; the latter may continue improving to the end of our days.

We breathe again. We shall not be a mockery for schoolboys. But if the professor is right, there seems to emerge a very important truth. If the intelligence does not grow after the age of fourteen, just as the body ceases a year or so later, surely

we are all on an average level again. We are *all* mentally fourteen, mathematicians and knife-grinders, university lecturers and booking-clerks. The great difference lies in "acquired knowledge and attainments." So that the argument that Socialism is a system of thought that is only comprehensible by the highly intelligent, followed by the statement that the working-class is not more than five per cent. intelligent, is not in accord with facts.

It is not a lack of intelligence that is the stumbling block, it is something else. Consider these facts. This journal you are now perusing has a fairly steady circulation. Its very steadiness argues that the same people read it pretty regularly year after year. We can agree that the contents and character of this journal are such as to appeal to none but intelligent people. And yet the membership of the party is only about a tenth of the circulation. Surely intelligent people should take intelligent action, and if, as our questioner insisted, intelligence is to be the touchstone, the outlook is indeed gloomy. Fortunately, there appear to us to be other avenues of hope. First, there is the information given by Dr. Burt, quoted above: "acquired knowledge . . . may continue improving to the end of our days." It should be the function of a Socialist movement to see that the working class acquires a knowledge of its position in society, its evolution, its problems and its destiny. This knowledge can only be propagated by the spoken or written word, possibly supplemented by the cinematograph.

The case for Socialism can be put, and has been put, in language easily comprehensible by a normal boy of fourteen. It is possibly more easily apprehended then, for use and wont have not dulled the mind into the ruts of habit. According to the professor, he is as intelligent then as he will ever be. It is in acquired knowledge that he will progress if at all. It should be the peculiar task of our movement to provide that knowledge, not in the form of a small journal appearing at intervals of a calendar month, but in every form the genius of man can devise. Capitalists who sell wares have discovered that man is a lazy animal, who moves when prodded often enough, who is most responsive to massed attack, and when subjected to a continuous reiteration of the same story. They have

found that the mere appearance of one word, like "Bovril," on every railway station, every hoarding, and in every important periodical in the country, has a powerful psychological effect. It becomes by sheer familiarity and persistence, part of the "acquired knowledge" encountered by the questing human mind. When we see every railway station in the country, every hoarding in the towns, every vehicle that carries advertisements, plastered with the word "Socialism"; when every bookstall and every bookshop is sprinkled with Socialist books and pamphlets; when Socialism is mentioned by every newspaper (even in detestation, as we should expect) every day, every week, every month, when the average man has Socialism thrust upon him, rammed at him, rained on him, insistently and persistently, in season and out of season, things will begin to move.

His intelligence may have ceased to grow at fourteen, but it will be sufficient. We must take care of his acquired knowledge. He will be helped—if it is suitably drummed into him—by the obvious increasing bankruptcy of capitalism and the incessant attacks on the workers' standard of living. To take the course suggested lays a heavy burden upon the pioneers of a movement such as ours. That is the essential problem of the immediate present. How can the handful of enthusiasts who initiate the movement, get together sufficient funds to drench the working-class with its literature, to make its presence not only felt, but inescapable, to so familiarise them with its propaganda that misrepresentation becomes ludicrous? How can they, out of their poverty, engender this avalanche of publicity that is to overcome the workers' normal and natural inertia, and get them definitely on the move? Let every intelligent man, who has added to his stock of acquired knowledge by reading this article, answer for himself. Every reader a member, and every member a party worker, that is our object. We shall move in proportion to our effort.

W. T. H.

GET TOGETHER!

Readers of the "Socialist Standard" who desire to be put into communication with other readers in their district are invited to notify the General Secretary, at 42 Great Dover Street, S.E.1.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

WHY WE OBEY THE L.C.C.

A correspondent writes to criticise us for "accepting the ruling of the L.C.C." which forbids us to take collections or sell literature in London commons and parks. He suggests that we ought to hold meetings of protest and get the audiences to show by means of a vote their disapproval of the L.C.C.'s action. The results of the votes should be forwarded to the L.C.C., and then he adds: "If the bye-law is not repealed, the L.C.C. is acting unconstitutionally and you can take a collection, sell literature, and tell the police."

Our correspondent's argument contains one fatal defect: his assumption that a bye-law ceases to be effective because a number of public meetings protest against it. Even if we assume (a very big assumption) that the Tory, Liberal, and Labour supporters who form the vast majority of the audiences who gather in public places, would support such a protest, the fact remains that a big majority of the members elected to sit on the London County Council are in favour of the ban, and their supporters, if not actively in favour, are at least not prepared to demand its withdrawal. It is not within the limited means of the S.P.G.B. to reach the whole of the electorate in London, and the few we can reach at our meetings are too few to change the composition or to influence the actions of the L.C.C. So long as the L.C.C. is composed of people who want the ban, so long will that bye-law remain in force. And so long as it remains in force, the L.C.C. have the power to see that it is carried out.

If our speakers ignored it, they would be faced, as several individuals (not our members) have already been faced, with fines or the alternative of imprisonment. Being a working-class organisation, we cannot light-heartedly accept the burden of paying a number of fines and of losing our jobs (those who have them) by going to prison. To do so in the case in question would, in any event, be without effect upon the L.C.C., since the imposition of such fines would please them without causing the slightest trouble or embarrassment. It would probably not even lose them votes.

When we have to consider taking such costly action, it must be for a purpose much

more worth while than fighting this particular bye-law, which, troublesome as it is, does not prevent us from carrying on propaganda. It has indeed decreased our income, and so far we have not been able to make good the loss in other directions. We hope, however, that our efforts to do so will prove successful in the near future.

ED. COMM.

* * *

BOUDIN AND MARX.

A correspondent draws our attention to the first paragraph on page 17 of Boudin's "Theoretical System of Karl Marx," which lays it down that the class which owns the new means of production is always victorious in its conflict with the older ruling class. Our correspondent points out that if this is true then the working class—not being property owners—will never achieve their emancipation. He also assumes that the passage in question is a quotation from Marx.

In the first place, the paragraph referred to is not a quotation from Marx and is not offered by Boudin as a quotation. The paragraph before this one and the paragraph after it are presented as quotations, and are taken from Marx's preface to his "Critique of Political Economy," but the quotation marks end with the paragraph before the one dealt with by our correspondent, and only begin again with the paragraph following.

The view put forward is certainly not that of Marx. It is also extremely improbable that it represents Boudin's considered view. The probable explanation is that Boudin here intended only to state as a fact in relation to past class struggles that the victory was with the class which owned the new means of production. That it should read as if it were intended to refer to all class struggles and to be an essential feature of class struggles can only have been a slip on the part of Boudin.

ED. COMM.

* * *

THE PAY OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

If the correspondent who wrote about the pay of teachers and civil servants will give his name and address (not necessarily for publication) we will reply to his criticism.

ED. COMM.

C. W. Morrow.—We do not know what your views may be in the future. It is sufficient that you have not found it possible to combine Socialism with religion. To say that a Socialist has the "free-will" to be a Christian if he wants to be, is like saying that he has the "free-will" to be an anti-Socialist, which is absurd. No, Mr. MacDonald is not a Socialist. The fact that some scientific men retain, outside the province of their scientific activities, beliefs which cannot be substantiated, does not prove these beliefs to be valid.

* * *

E. Tinkler.—We suggest that you read our pamphlet, "Socialism and Religion," and then write to us again. ED. COMM.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sunday ... Liverpool St., Walworth Rd., 11.30 a.m.
Clapham Common, 3.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.45 a.m.
Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m.
Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 11.30 a.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 7.30 p.m.
Ridley Road, Hackney, 8 p.m.

Monday ... Stepney Green, 8 p.m.

Wednesday ... Paragon Road, Mare Street, 8 p.m.
Thane Villas, Hornsey Road, 8 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 8 p.m.
Forest Gate Station, 8 p.m.
Magdalen Road, Earlsfield, 8 p.m.

Thursday ... Tottenham Road, Kingsland Road, 8 p.m.

Friday ... Prince of Wales, Harrow Road, 8 p.m.
Battersea, Mossbury Road, 8.15 p.m.

Saturday ... Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.
Brentford High Street, 8 p.m.

MANCHESTER.

Sunday ... Platt Park, 3 p.m.
Eccles Cross, 7 p.m.

EDINBURGH.

Wednesdays ... The Mound, 8 p.m.

Fridays ... The Mound, 7 p.m.

Saturdays ... The Mound, 7 p.m.

Sundays ... The Mound, 7 p.m.

GLASGOW DISTRICT.

Sundays ... West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.

Thursdays ... Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

Fill in and post to 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E. 1, and get this paper regularly.

I lease send me the "Socialist Standard" for 12 months, for which I enclose 2/6.

Name:

Address:

Date:

(If required only for 6 months, send 1/3).

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Fridays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.

HULL.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month at 213 Beverly Road. Communications to M. V. Coupland at above address.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month at 8.15 p.m. at Room 2, 183 Oxford Road, All Saints.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 74, Glenalmond Road.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING. Branch meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursday the month at the Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17. Sec. (pro-tem), H. E. Hutchins, 174, Haydon's Road, South Wimbledon, S.W. 19.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N. 8. Branch meets 2nd 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m. at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 316 Vol. 27.]

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1930

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

WHAT THE SOCIALIST PARTY STANDS FOR.

Many new readers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are puzzled when they find that the Socialist Party claims to be opposed to the Labour Party and I.L.P., not merely in matters of method, but also in respect of the object to be worked for. This puzzled state of mind is easy to understand. It arises from the use, by ourselves and by those other parties, of terms and phrases which appear to have a similar meaning. When a member of the Labour Party speaks of "Nationalisation," the newspapers will assume that he means Socialism, and the Labour Party leaders often have no interest in removing the false impression. It is the practice of many of the widely-read newspapers always to describe Labour M.P.s as Socialist M.P.s. Confusion has been increased in recent years by the use in the Labour Party's official programme of a form of words which resembles a passage in our Object. Where we say, "The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community"; the Labour Party's object, as set out in "Labour and the Nation," is "to secure for the producers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service."

The phrasing of the Labour Party's object tends to be vague, and is in one particular plainly inaccurate. It speaks of securing for the producers the "full fruits of their industry"; but if this were to be

carried out the non-producers—among them the young, the infirm, and the old—would get nothing. The Labour Party here refer to common ownership, and it is very important to us that the apparent similarity with our aim should be challenged. We would rather be opposed for what we are and for what we aim at, than be supported, under a misapprehension, for what we are not. Let it, then, be clearly understood that the aims of the two parties are essentially different. The Labour Party stands for nationalisation, which is a form of capitalism embodying all of the chief features of the system of society which the Socialist Party works to abolish. When the Labour Party writes "common ownership" they have in mind such institutions as the Post Office and Mr. Morrison's proposed London Traffic Corporation; but these are not "commonly owned." The owners of the Post Office are the capitalist investors in Government Telegraph and Telephone loans and other Government stocks, and the capitalist class as a whole. Their tax burden is reduced by the Post Office profits.

Ownership to the capitalist no longer ordinarily involves the actual personal possession and control of plant, land, factories, etc. It is good enough for him that his stock or share certificates entitle him to a portion of the unearned property-income, which flows from ownership by the exploitation of the workers. The railway shareholder does not own any particular part of the railway system, nor does he wish to do so. If the Labour Party gives him shares in Government loans instead of his company shares he will not be a penny the worse. He will, on the contrary, have gained through the increased security of his holding.

The capitalist will not be a penny the worse and the workers will not be a penny the better for the change. The workers will still be wage-earners producing wealth for others and receiving back as wages and salary enough to enable them and their families to live. That is not Socialism or common ownership. The Socialist Party opposes it without qualification.

If there are Labour Party supporters who doubt the accuracy of the outline given above, we would refer them to the words of Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Snowden on the subject.

Mr. MacDonald, in his book, "Socialism: Critical and Constructive," first published in 1921, deals (Chapter VII) with the part which the capitalist will play in society moulded on Labour Party lines. On pages 302 and 303 (Cassell's pocket edition), he says that property becomes defensible "when Labour uses capital and pays it its market value." ("Urges" in the Cassell edition is a misprint for "uses.") Mr. MacDonald's wording is odd, but his meaning is not in doubt. He envisages a retention of capitalism with the capitalist shorn of some of his present privilege.

Mr. Philip Snowden, writing in the "Manchester Guardian Commercial Reconstruction Supplement," on 26th October, 1922, put the case in a nutshell:—

The nationalisation of . . . public services does not carry the Labour Party further than many Radicals, who would vigorously disclaim being socialistic, are prepared to go. The nationalisation of mines has been recommended by a Royal Commission, not preponderantly Labour or Socialist. The Land Nationalisation Society has among its vice-presidents a large number of M.P.s who do not belong to the Labour Party.

Mr. Snowden wrote in the same issue:—

The British Labour Party is certainly not Socialist in the sense in which Socialism is understood upon the Continent. It is not based upon the recognition of the class struggle; it does not accept the teachings of Marx. . . . The Socialism of the Labour Party is just a matter of fact, practical aim for the extension of the already widely accepted principle of the democratic ownership and control of the essential public services.

And that aim, as we have explained, is not Socialism at all. It is State capitalism. It is not "democratic ownership and control," but State control for the private owners.

It may be mentioned that Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Snowden were at that time active and influential members of the

I.L.P., whose object is indistinguishable from that of the Labour Party, to which it is affiliated.

The Labour Party, in "Labour and the Nation," promises to "introduce the maximum possible publicity as to costs and profits." Our aim is quite different. We propose not to give publicity to profits but to abolish profits and all forms of living by owning property, a way of life which can continue only through the exploitation of the workers.

Under Socialism there will not be a class of property owners, and a class of non-owners compelled to sell their labour power to an employer in order to live. The wages system will have disappeared for ever. Men and women will produce the articles all need, not for sale and for profit-making, but for the use of all. If this appears to be a staggering proposal, just stop and ask what other remedy there can be for the colossal and permanent over-production and unemployment from which the workers suffer in a capitalist society. If it seems strange to suggest that people will easily fall into the habit of working without being driven by the threat of unemployment, remember that even under capitalism probably three-fifths of the population, men, women and children, get their living in some other way than by selling their labour power to an employer. We see the capitalist class living without any compulsion to work. We see children, invalids and the aged, more or less well cared for by relatives and friends. We see wives working for husbands and families, and rarely doing so on the job-and-cash basis which the economists like to pretend is so essential to civilisation. We even see millions of workers who have a greater or less degree of security against unemployment, working in much the same way as workers differently placed. Finally, we see a vast network of voluntary organisations carrying on every kind of activity outside, and without the stimulus of, the wages system. And who will venture to assert that the work of the genuine amateur is less conscientious, less thorough, and less fruitful than that of the paid employee?

There remains another question which interests many who have grasped the outlines of the case for Socialism. "What," we are asked by a reader, "will be done under Socialism to secure the distribution

of luxuries like diamonds, pearl necklaces, fur coats, motor cars, etc. Would we all have these things if we desired them; only a few of us; or nobody at all?"

There are really two quite different questions raised here. There are people who want and will want jewellery, fur coats and motor cars, because they like these things; because they want to be adorned, want to be warm, and want to travel comfortably. Under Socialism society will have to weigh up the merits and demerits of producing a supply of such articles adequate for those who want them. Society will have to decide whether it is worth while trying to produce fur coats as well as, or in place of, cloth coats, if to do so will involve a considerable inroad into the powers of producing other things. Before the community as a whole will consent to give up all-round comfort in order to secure luxury in some one direction, it will have to be persuaded that the choice is a wise one. The advocates of diamonds and fur coats will have to get down to the task of converting their less luxuriously-minded fellow citizens.

The other aspect of our reader's question is easily disposed of. At present diamonds are worn by the few only because they are beyond the reach of the many. The diamond companies get the Governments to intervene by force of arms to prevent outsiders from tapping new diamond areas, and thus flooding the market. Should Socialist society decide to provide diamonds for all, probably 99 out of a 100 of those who now have or who now hunger for diamonds would want diamonds no more.

Socialist society will not be able to provide the fantastic needs of every dreamer who craves for the moon, but it will plainly have to produce many articles not required at all by some of its members and required in unequal quantities by others. H.

HAVE YOU READ

—this Pamphlet

"SOCIALISM."

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

HOW TO STUDY SOCIALISM.

Readers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD and listeners at our meetings will have realised that we attach great importance to the workers having a knowledge of certain basic principles and being able to apply them to the questions of the day. That is how Socialists are made, and it is the only way. The worker who wishes to save himself from taking in and acting upon the theories and policies of the various capitalist parties must himself get to understand the economic and political problems which face him. This requires a certain amount of study, but it is well within the reach of the average worker. It is less difficult than many of the technical studies which workers have to pursue in order to get and keep their jobs in the employers' factories, workshops and offices. The study of economics and politics from the working class viewpoint is not only interesting in itself—something which can be said of all systematic expansion of our knowledge of the world we live in—but it has the additional attraction that it touches at every point the actual conditions of the life of the working class. That is to say, it is a study which, so far from being divorced from action, leads directly to the adoption of policies in line with our own economic interests. Knowledge of Socialism colours the everyday thoughts and actions of the Socialist, enables him to understand and appreciate at their true value the social forces with which he has to deal, and gives him that confidence which is indispensable for the organisation of the working class, the conquest of the powers of government, and the building up of Socialism.

How is such a study to be undertaken? What books should be read, and how are the students' difficulties to be dealt with? These questions are in the minds of all who approach the task for the first time. To the limit of our present resources we hold meetings, and arrange study classes and discussions at Head Office and in the branches. The student should attend these meetings and classes.

He should read the books advertised in these columns. They are works which we can recommend, and we shall be pleased to advise as to the works which a beginner should tackle first.

But above all there is THE SOCIALIST

STANDARD itself. From month to month, over a period of 26 years, Socialist principles have been applied to current problems, every aspect of capitalism has been examined and explained, every policy presented to the workers has been criticised and its value assessed, every anti-working-class party has been exposed. Hundreds of well-informed articles have made accessible useful knowledge from almost every field of study, and hundreds of students' difficulties have been answered.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is not like a "news" journal, out of date almost as soon as it is published. It is a record of the past history of working-class movements, packed with invaluable information on their failures and on the false theories and policies which made failure inevitable. It is no exaggeration to say that there is no other comparable source to which the worker with his limited leisure and means can go for reliable guidance in the study of social problems. It is to meet this need that we offer bound volumes for sale. They are well bound and are sold at a price which leaves only a small margin over the actual cost of binding and postage. We cannot too strongly urge members and sympathisers to order one or more volumes and get down to study during the winter months. An announcement as to prices is printed elsewhere in this issue.

BOUND VOLUMES.

Bound volumes of THE SOCIALIST STANDARD can be supplied at the following rates (post free):—

For Years up to August, 1918.

1 year vol. ...	6/6	post free.
2 " " ...	8/3	" "
3 " " ...	9/3	" "
4 " " ...	10/9	" "

(There is only a limited number of copies for these years.)

For Years from September, 1918, onwards.

1 year vol. ...	5/6	post free.
2 " " ...	7/3	" "
3 " " ...	8/9	" "
4 " " ...	10/3	" "

(The pages of the issues up to August, 1918, are of larger size than those of later issues. They therefore cannot be bound up together.)

LIGHT ON SOVIET RUSSIA.

"Economic Trends in Soviet Russia." By A. Yugoff. (George Allen & Unwin.)

The above volume is intended as a broad general outline of affairs in Russia. It affords considerable support to the position maintained by the Socialist Party since the Bolshevik upheaval.

"Soviet Russia," says the author, in his introduction, "is a land of economic contrasts and oppositions. In the towns there are huge factories and workshops; in the countryside, a natural economy is still almost exclusively dominant. Huge trusts and syndicates, embracing whole branches of industry and commerce, confront independent home workers and itinerant traders. Theoretically, and as a matter of principle, all the economic life of the country is under State control; whilst in practice currency crises, crises of production, gluts, crises of demand, press hard on one another's heels, and are renewed ever and again by the spontaneous play of economic forces and by the lack of due proportion between the various branches of economic life."

Furthermore, in latter-day Russia we can see a peculiarly vivid picture of the results of artificially cultivated Socialist economic forms in a country where neither the economic nor the social conditions are ripe for anything of the kind; we can note what a caricature of true Socialism such an enforced 'Socialism' must be."

"Two conflicting tendencies are at work in Soviet Russia to-day. One of them has originated out of the new economic and social situation created by the revolution, the overthrow of Tsarism, and the freshly-created possibilities for a rapid unfolding of productive forces alike in industry and agriculture. The other, which Communist policy has artificially introduced into the realm of economic reality acts as a brake upon economic progress, rivets Utopian fetters upon these same productive forces, and gives rise to a pendulum swing from 'right' to 'left,' and then back to 'right' again."

Yugoff holds that not only is Russia unripe for Socialism, but that the elaborate bureaucratic structure of nationalisation which the Communist rulers have built up, is a barrier to the capitalist development, which is an essential preliminary to the

establishment of Socialism. Nationalisation, he points out, is not Socialism; it has been adopted by the most reactionary governments on occasions when it has suited their interests, and does not in itself necessarily constitute economic progress. In this, Yugoff merely repeats what Engels says in his little work, "Socialism; Utopian and Scientific" (see footnote and text on pp. 83-4-5); but he shows also the practical bearing of this fact on the Russian situation.

Nationalisation was adopted by the Bolsheviks as a result of the chaos ensuing from the economic collapse in 1916-17, their seizure of power and the civil war. It was an emergency measure and was carried a good deal further than Lenin had suggested as being desirable in his writings just prior to the events of October-November, 1917. (See "Preparing for Revolt.") Having adopted it as an immediate policy, however, the Bolsheviks proceeded to make the most extravagant claims for it. The collapse of the currency was hailed as the prelude to the final disappearance of money; the system of compulsory rationing became the first step towards a planned economy. Small wonder then that the partial reversion to normal capitalism, represented by the N.E.P., should have been regretted by a considerable section of the ruling party as a retreat. Yugoff, however, maintains that the logical implications of the N.E.P. have never been carried out, and the reason is not far to seek.

"During the process of nationalisation thousands upon thousands of private property owners were replaced by new hosts of 'red' bureaucrats, trust managers and commissaries, who gobbled up all the savings which might otherwise have been made by the expropriation of the expropriators" (p. 99).

The Bolsheviks nationalised thousands of small enterprises whose owners were also their managers; but the new rulers lacked the technical resources necessary to the reconstruction of these enterprises upon a larger and more economical scale. Hence the surplus value extracted from the workers' labour did not even provide fresh capital for the expansion of industry. It was swallowed up in "administrative expenses." The motive of private gain remained the only one capable of acting as a stimulus to the accumulation of capital.

The Bolsheviks, in introducing the New

Economic Policy, of course, recognised this fact; but having entrenched themselves in the realm of State industry, their parasitic, bureaucratic supporters are loath to surrender to outsiders the privileges which they enjoy. So far from having been smashed, the State in Russia has expanded into an excrescence which stands in the way of further economic development.

Hence the struggle between those who claim to be intent upon "building up Socialism" and the new class of private capitalists who are arising partly in spite of the Bolsheviks' efforts, but partly also as a result of them.

In order to provide the capital for the expansion of State industry, the old Tsarist expedient of taxing the peasantry is adopted; but carried beyond a certain point, this defeats its own object by checking agricultural accumulation and the growth of food supplies and raw materials. The experiment of State farms, as Yugoff shows, involves inroads upon peasant cultivation which reduce numbers of peasants to beggary and increase the drift to the towns. The increase in the unemployed is greater than the industries of the State can absorb, and the way is thus opened up for private exploiters to embark upon industrial enterprise. Thus, sooner or later, Yugoff argues, the heavy hand of the State upon trade and industry will be relaxed. In the interests of an expanding capitalism, the State monopoly of foreign commerce will be broken down; but in so far as these measures involve the abolition of the economic basis of the dictatorship, a serious political change is the essential preliminary. Yugoff puts the question: What form is this likely to take?

He sees three possible alternatives. "A democratic State authority might be set up; or part of the Communist Party might be transformed into a party of the possessing classes (Thermidor); or, finally, there might be a Bonapartist, or reactionary coup-d'état. No one can foresee which course development will take. This much, however, is certain, that the party which now rules in the U.S.S.R. is no longer a party of the working class; is not a party which can carry out a policy of socialisation; is not even a party competent to promote in any consistent or enduring fashion the interests of the working class" (pp. 335-6).

Not that Yugoff blames the Communists for their failure to work a miracle. Indeed, his work is, in its way, a masterpiece of scientific method. He sees in the "dictators" the creatures rather than the creators of the present transitional period in Russia from feudalism to capitalism. Even the very illusions, which he credits them with sharing with their followers in the early days of the Revolution, have in Yugoff's eyes an historical function. Intoxicated with the idea of an impending world Socialist revolution, the workers of Russia accomplished a task which the Russian capitalists were incapable of doing for themselves. They swept the last vestiges of feudalism from Russian society. They assisted the peasants to lay hands upon the land and free themselves "from the burden of high rents, land taxes, and interest on mortgages," which Yugoff describes as the main historical task of the revolution.

No sooner, however, had the peasants overthrown the old ruling class in the country than a new one began to appear in the towns. This new class grows at the expense both of the peasants and the urban working class, converting by degrees the former into the latter. Thus, in spite of certain differences, economic history in Russia repeats that of Western Europe.

The temptation to quote Yugoff's three final chapters at some length is great, but the following brief extract must suffice: "Behind the Socialist façade the features of a society which, though new, though born out of the revolution, is fundamentally capitalist, are disclosing themselves more plainly day by day; we must do our utmost to dispel the illusion that this revolution is a Socialist one, so that the working class (hitherto deceived) may be enabled to hold at least the second line of its revolutionary position, and may escape being crushed politically and morally as soon as the nature of the masquerade becomes plain to all the world." (pp. 320-1). For Yugoff sees quite plainly that the adversaries of Socialism can make good use of the Communist Party's failure. "They declare that the failure of nationalisation in Russia is tantamount to the failure of Socialism. . . . They consider that the Russian experiment provides them with a powerful weapon of defence against the struggle of the working class for Socialism" (p. 95).

To thoroughly appreciate Yugoff's book, however, it is necessary to compare it with others that profess to cover similar ground. Mr. Maurice Dobb's volume, "Russian Economic Development," for instance, while more fully detailed, is vitiated by economic inaccuracies, chief of which is the fallacy that Russian development is Socialist. Mr. Farbman's writings, while illuminating in many particulars, make no attempt to offer an explanation for the effects which he describes. They cannot therefore be classed as scientific. Anatole Baikoff's little book, "In the Land of Communist Dictatorship," remains equally superficial, in spite of the author's industrious accumulation of data exploding the stories of the Workers' Paradise.

Yugoff's book will be far from welcome to so-called reformers, Communist and Labour Party alike, to whom nationalisation is the panacea for working class ills. Miss Ellen Wilkinson, for instance, in the July "Plebs," finds it somewhat "disturbing." More important, however, than this, it spikes the guns of reactionaries, Tory and Liberal, who, ever since the introduction of the New Economic Policy, have sedulously paraded the legend that Socialism has failed in Russia. By laying bare the economic forces actually at work the author has stripped the Russian Revolution of its romance and enabled us the better to understand its reality.

Both publishers and translators (Eden and Cedar Paul) are to be congratulated on the results of their efforts. E. B.

Sunday Evening Meetings. Head Office.

Date.	Subject.	Speaker.
December 7th	E. Willmott
	'The Fraud of Reforms.'	
December 14th	Gilmac
	'Is Parliament Played Out.'	
December 21st	W. Howard
	'The Bolshevik Upheaval—Its Aims and Outcome.'	

Meetings commence at 8 p.m. All invited.
Discussion and Question. Admission Free.

Contributions are earnestly invited to assist us with the expense of publishing more literature.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS

W. JENNINGS (Harringay).

If you or the anonymous member of the Manchester Reform Club will give some evidence (as distinct from a mere unsupported assertion), that the workers "are immeasurably more comfortable than in the most prosperous pre-war times," we shall be prepared to consider it.

* * *

TAXES AND THE SMALLHOLDER.

A correspondent asks if smallholders would be better off if taxes were lowered by the abolition of unemployment pay. Small scale producers in general are at a disadvantage because small-scale production is uneconomic, because they pay heavily for transport, and because they are in competition with big and powerful rivals. If the total amount of taxes were reduced it does not follow that those who control the Government would pass on the benefit to smallholders; and if they did it does not follow that the smallholder would actually benefit. The conditions might very well permit the land owners to put up the rent. Moreover, a lowering or abolition of unemployment pay might well increase the number of those trying to make a living as smallholders and thus make competition among them still keener. In U.S.A. where there is no unemployment pay, millions of small farmers have been squeezed out of business since the war.

* * *

THE PAY OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

A correspondent writes to criticise our statement in the September issue that the pay of the various grades of civil servants is no better than the pay of outside workers. To support his point he compares the pay of a policeman with that of a watchman, and the pay of an L.C.C. school teacher with that of a private governess. Our correspondent makes the error of not comparing like with like, and the comparisons therefore have no point. If he imagines that his comparisons are sound will he tell us of any police force recruited from watchmen, and any education authority which appoints unqualified governesses as its teachers?

We did not say that civil servants are paid less than outside workers (although

incidentally the higher grades are paid less in many cases than comparable grades outside).

Our correspondent objects to our comparison between the Post Office staff and the London Underground Railway staff, on the ground that the latter "prides itself on the high wages it pays." The objection is pointless. In the first place the Post Office also prides itself on its high wages, and in the second place every firm of any size and standing makes the same claim.

We would emphasise that although our correspondent challenges our statement he is unable to give a single instance which will support his assertion that civil servants are "an aristocracy among the working class." The illustrations which he uses break down because he gives untenable comparisons. (In passing it may be mentioned that neither Teachers nor Policemen are civil servants in the proper meaning of the term.)

We do not deny that the ruling class would, if they thought necessary, protect their interests by paying their state servants generously. The facts, however, bear out our view that in practice the ruling class have not in general found that policy necessary. We would in conclusion return to the main point, which is that nationalisation or state capitalism does not solve any problem for the working class.

ED. COMM.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA.

Readers in Australia are invited to communicate with the Socialist Party of Australia at 99, Esplanade, West Port, Melbourne.

THE WORKERS' SOCIALIST PARTY (U.S.A.).

Readers in the U.S.A. are invited to communicate with the Workers' Socialist Party of the United States, at 315, East 14th Street, New York City.

The Workers' Socialist Party are our agents in the U.S.A., and the "SOCIALIST STANDARD" is obtainable from them at the above address.

CLASS AT HEAD OFFICE.

The following class is held at Head Office:

ECONOMICS. Wednesday evenings, 8 p.m.
The class is free and open to all.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 42, Great Dover Street, London, S.E.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free... .. 2s. 6d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

DEC.,



1930

WAGES UNDER LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

One of the things Labour Governments are supposed to do is to keep up wages. Since the present Government came in, there have been big reductions in the wool, cotton and jute industries, and there are now pending movements to reduce wages in building, agriculture, mining, boot and shoe production, and railways. These applications for reductions cover about three million workers.

But the biscuit must be awarded to Mr. Snowden and Mr. Addison.

Mr. Snowden, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, controls the Civil Service. Their cost of living bonus is governed by an agreement, made as a temporary measure in 1920. The agreement never gave them the full increase corresponding to the rise in prices, and it is admitted that their cost of living has not fallen by as large a percentage as is indicated by the Ministry of Labour index. The staff's claim for a revised agreement was side-tracked by being referred to the Civil Service Royal Commission, and they therefore contend that until the Commission reports, no further reductions should have taken place. Mr. Snowden replied by giving them a 5 point

reduction. When they protested, he replied by lamenting the "ingratitude" of the Civil Servants.

Why workers in Government employ should be grateful when a Labour Government, contrary to the whole theory of the Labour Party, reduces their pay, it is difficult to understand.

Mr. Addison, Minister of Agriculture, went one better.

According to the *Landworker*, of November, the employers' representatives on a Yorkshire Agricultural Wages Committee moved for a reduction in wages, but were outvoted by the workers' and "neutral" representatives. The employers thereupon withdrew, and Mr. Addison has now asked the neutral representatives to resign, and refuses to re-appoint them. He indignantly denies that he is looking for "neutral" representatives who will agree to wages reductions, but admits that he wants people with whom the farmers will consent to sit. But this, of course, means precisely the same thing. The farmers are not objecting to neutral representatives because of the colour of their hair, but because they voted down a wage reduction. The farmers will continue to decline to sit until they get their way, and the Minister of Agriculture, who has power to prevent this, helps the farmers under a veil of "impartiality."

The Labour Government has failed to offer to the workers any means of escape from the capitalist system. It fails equally to help them make the best of capitalism by resisting wage reductions.

AN IMPORTANT EVENT.**Formation of the Workers' Socialist Party, (U.S.A.)**

Ten months ago we announced that our comrades in the Socialist Educational Society of America had launched a monthly paper, "The Socialist." After a short but useful life, publication of the new journal had to be suspended owing to the aggravated unemployment which hit the U.S.A. The promoters of the paper found their own pockets less able to meet the expense of publication because many of them were out of work, and the audiences at street corner meetings were in a similar plight, and could not buy the paper, or give so generously to collections. For the

time being the American organisation has to manage without a journal, but this has not prevented the carrying on of meetings and educational activities, and we are pleased to chronicle the founding of the "Workers' Socialist Party of the United States," on September 8th.

Like ourselves, the members of the American Party are asked why they are adding to the number of Socialist parties. Is America not already blessed with a multiplicity of so-called Labour, Farmer, Socialist, and Communist parties? Why start another? Why increase the confusion? The answer is the one given by the S.P.G.B. in this country; there is no way of challenging and destroying the confused theories and spurious programmes of the parties which promise to reform capitalism except by building up from the ground an organisation of Socialists working only for Socialism.

It will, perhaps, sound odd to justify the new party in America by referring to something outside America, but it will, nevertheless, be found true on examination that the condition of the working class in Great Britain is proof enough of the need for the Workers' Socialist Party in the U.S.A. In Great Britain we have the counterpart of all of the reform parties of the U.S.A., but with a difference. Here they have been more successful, and one of them, the Labour Party, has twice formed the Government, and before that was represented in Coalition Cabinets. In this country a very large part of the reform legislation demanded by bodies such as the "Socialist Party of America," which is the American equivalent of the I.L.P., has been put on the Statute Book. But to what effect? Every year that passes, despite its certain crop of new reforms, shows the working class rather worse off than before in relation to the wealth and power of the capitalist class. Every year shows more clearly the need for a Socialist Party striving for Socialism, and the uselessness of all of the parties of reform. Reform of capitalism through Communist violence is no better than reform through the Fabian "inevitability of gradualness." Only the Socialist Party has consistently pointed to the one sure road. After our years of effort it is, then, encouraging to see comrades taking up the task for themselves in other countries. Like the Socialist Party of Australia, the Workers' Socialist

Party of the United States is based upon our Declaration of Principles, with only the minor alterations required because of the different terminology of the institutions of that country.

We offer our congratulations and good wishes to our two companion parties.

THE FRENCH SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST PARTY.

We have received from Paul Louis, General Secretary of the French Socialist-Communist Party, a letter concerning the article on International Organisation in our November issue. Below is a translation of the chief passages:—

Comrade,—I reply briefly to the remarks in your journal relating to our party: (1) Our object is identical with your own; (2) we are advocates of an International Conference to be attended by all the Socialist and Communist parties of the world. The Conference would discuss a programme of action based on Marxian principles. It is on this basis that unity ought to be achieved; (3) for us electoral action is only a means of propaganda. The proletariat will obtain power by revolution or by the breaking up of the capitalist class.

It will be seen that the proposed international conference is to be founded on the illusion that a gathering of socialists and communists could find common ground "based on Marxian principles." We claim that the anti-working class actions and policies of the communists are in direct contradiction to the essential policies worked out by Marx and verified by experience.

The third point of the letter indicates a dangerous defect in the policy of the French Socialist-Communist Party. The rejection of the vote as a means of obtaining control of the political machinery leaves only one apparent alternative, i.e., the communist policy of attempting to overthrow the armed forces of the State by a working-class uprising. That way lies nothing but disaster.

H.

OUR CIRCULATION.

The efforts of our readers in response to the appeal in the November issue have brought a considerable increase in the number of our postal subscribers, and in the requests for information about the Party. Do not relax your efforts.

PARLIAMENT OR SOVIET.

A REPLY TO THE "PROLETARIAN" (U.S.A.)

In our August number we pointed out that a certain John Keracher, of the American "Proletarian," contributed an article to their July number which contained a covert attack on our principles and policy. That although our Declaration of Principles was quoted, our name had not been mentioned.

The October number of the "Proletarian" contains a reply to our criticism. Although Keracher had not thought it worth while mentioning our name in the previous article he now finds the matter so important that he devotes nearly *twelve columns* (nearly half of the paper) to us. And further, the matter was of such urgency that copies of the "Proletarian" were sent to the branches of our Party!

Throughout these twelve columns Keracher quotes portions of paragraphs of Marx and Engels in the effort to wring from them an interpretation they will not bear. We pointed out in our criticism that quotations in the previous article had been made without the source being indicated. Keracher now tries to take refuge in the statement that we ought to know the source! The "Proletarian" is supposed to be a paper written for working men, and therefore, if working men are to test the truth of evidence brought forward they must be able to go to the source for that purpose. But as the "Proletarian," like other Communist organs, depends upon the ignorance of the workers, its writers are not over-anxious to give the workers the opportunity to see the frailty of the case put forward. As we cannot spare twelve columns to deal with Keracher, we will only take his leading points, and demonstrate his slipperiness, without following him up all his by-paths.

At the end of our criticism of the "Proletarian" article we asked how they proposed getting rid of the armed force, at present controlled by the capitalist through Parliament, which stood in the way of any attempt to alter the foundations of society. This is the reply:—

Getting control of Parliament does not mean that the workers have gained control of the public power of coercion, the State. At such a critical moment the capitalist class (not so stupid as the S.P. of G.B.) will send its "armed forces" to disperse the Parliamentary representatives. The real State will show itself.

For sheer stupidity the above takes the palm. How can the "capitalist class send its armed forces"? Are the capitalists sitting in a room somewhere, issuing orders?

The issuing of orders, the appointment and control of officials, and everything else connected with the operation of the armed forces, is in the hands of the group in Parliament that for the time constitutes the Government, i.e., has the majority. Time after time we have given abundant evidence of this fact in these columns.

The armed force is a part of the governmental machinery, the whole of which depends for its efficiency upon co-ordination. If the co-ordination breaks down the machinery becomes useless, or anarchy sets in. The co-ordination comes from the centre—Parliament.

After the above quotation comes the following paragraph:—

If "the armed forces of the nation," most of it working men, remains loyal to the ruling class, then the proletariat will have to submit to a military dictatorship of the capitalists. If, on the other hand, the rank and file of the army and navy goes over to the working class, then the political power will have passed from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. It is during this period that the new State form . . . will make its appearance. The Paris Commune and the Russian Soviet arose spontaneously out of the revolution itself.

A couple of "if's" are very weak material to base a course of action upon. Secondly, as the capitalists are alleged to be able to send their armed forces where they like, irrespective of the intentions of Parliament, surely the only inference to be drawn is that there is already a military dictatorship here now. Thirdly, how is "the new State form" going to make its appearance; pop up suddenly like a mushroom overnight? Fourthly, the Russian Soviet did not arise in 1917, but many years before. Fifthly, according to Trotzky, "It is true that the English Trades Unions may become a powerful lever for the revolution; they may even, in certain circumstances and for a certain time, be a substitute for the Workers' Soviets." (The Lessons of October, 1917, p. 75.) Sixthly, the Paris Commune was able to arise because the armed force of the French Government was "resting" in German prison camps.

In the cases of both the Communards and the Bolsheviks they were able to seize power because, owing to an unusually

favourable set of circumstances, the armed force that would have stood in the way had already been got rid of, or rendered innocuous by those who previously controlled State power. And we are asked to depend upon such a situation in the future instead of using the weapons we have at hand. Could stupidity go further?

Now let us give an example of Keracher's slippery method of arguing. He says:—

"The Communists proposed decentralisation," writes Gilmac approvingly. "There is nothing approving or disapproving in a statement of fact. But Keracher, unable to meet the point, takes refuge, like other wrigglers, in trying to foist upon his opponents views they do not hold."

Mr. Keracher wants to have it both ways. To him the Paris Commune and the Russian Soviet Government are both "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labour."

Let us give quotations from authorities upon each form.

Engels, in his introduction to the Paris Commune, points out that the Blanquists in the Commune acted in a way exactly the opposite of their former attitude:—

The Blanquists fared no better. Brought up in the School of Conspiracy, held together by the rigid discipline essential to it, they started from the conception that a comparatively small number of resolute, well-organised men would be able not only to grasp the helm of State at a favourable moment, but also through the display of great energy and reckless daring, to hold it as long as required; that is, until they had succeeded in carrying the masses of the people into the revolutionary current, and ranging them around the small leading band. To accomplish this, what was necessary, above all else, was the most stringent dictatorial centralisation of all power in the hands of the new revolutionary Government. And what did the Commune do—which in the majority consisted of these very Blanquists? In all its proclamations to the French people in the Provinces, it called upon them for a free federation of all French communes with Paris, for a National Organisation, which for the first time was to be the real creation of the nation. The Army, the Political Police, the Bureaucracy, all those agencies of oppression in a centralised government, which Napoleon had created in 1798, and which since then every new government had gladly used and kept up as ready weapons against its enemies, were to be abolished everywhere as they had been abolished in Paris. —(The Paris Commune, p. 10, N.Y.L.N.Co.)

The following quotations from Lenin and Zinovieff show the rigid centralisation of the Bolshevik Government, and the way a

portion of the Russian Communist Party kept power to themselves:—

It proves that unqualified centralisation and the strictest discipline of the proletariat are among the principal conditions for the victory over the bourgeoisie.—(Left Wing Communism, by N. Lenin, p. 110.)

If Bolshevism could successfully, and under the greatest difficulties, achieve in 1917-1920 the strictest centralisation and iron discipline, it was due simply to a series of historical peculiarities of Russia.—(Left Wing Communism, p. 11.)

Our Central Committee has decided to deprive certain categories of party members the right to vote at the Congress of the Party. Certainly it is unheard of to limit the right of voting within the party, but the entire party has approved this measure, which is to assure the homogeneous unity of the Communists.

So that, in fact, we have 500,000 members who manage the entire State machine from top to bottom.—(Report by Zinovieff to First Congress of 3rd International, March, 1919. The Socialist, 29th April, 1920.)

One of our misfortunes was that we had to take over the old State apparatus.—(The New Economic Policy, by Lenin. The Communist, 16th Dec., 1922.)

Now, Mr. Keracher, which is "the political form at last discovered," the Commune or the Russian Government? Attempted witticisms are no answer to facts.

Keracher quotes a statement from Engels' "Origin of the Family," but he only quotes a few lines from a paragraph, and then, later, he quotes another few lines from the same paragraph, but in connection with a different matter. The part he quotes first and attempts to make considerable use of is as follows:—

Universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It can and never will be anything else in the modern State. But that is sufficient. On the day when the thermometer of universal suffrage reaches its boiling point among the labourers, they as well as the capitalists will know what to do.

Keracher, at the end of his article, asks us what Engels meant by this. We will tell him in Engels' own words. First from another, and later, writing of Engels, and then from the paragraph from which the above is torn, as well as from what is probably the most read of all Engels' writings, "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific."

In 1895, the year of his death, and twenty-three years after the Paris Commune, Engels wrote an introduction to a reprint of Marx's "Class Struggles in France." In this introduction Engels says:—

When Bismarck now found it necessary to

introduce universal suffrage as the only means of interesting the masses of the people in his designs, our workers were not slow to make a serious use of the new opportunity, and they sent August Bebel to the first constituent Reichstag. From that day to this they have utilised the suffrage in a manner which has rewarded them a thousandfold, and been an example to the workers of all other lands. To quote the words employed concerning the suffrage in the French Marxist programme, "ils l'ont transformé, de moyen duperie qu'il a été jusqu'ici, en instrument d'émancipation"—they have changed it from a means of deceit, such as it has been hitherto, into a means of emancipation . . . even if it did no more than enable us to gauge our own strength and that of our opponents, thus preserving us alike from undue faintheartedness and from overweening rashness—if that were all universal suffrage had done for us, it would have been amply worth while.

But it has done more than this. Electoral agitation supplied us with a method of unsurpassed value for getting into contact with those strata of the populace which still held aloof from us, and for compelling the other parties to defend themselves publicly against the attacks we delivered upon their opinions and their actions. Moreover, in the Reichstag it provided our representatives with a platform from which to their opponents in Parliament and to the masses outside they could speak alike with far more authority and with greater freedom than had been possible in the Press and in public meetings. Of what use to the Government and to the bourgeoisie was their Socialist Law when electoral agitation and the speeches of Socialist deputies in the Reichstag were continually rendering its restrictions nugatory?

With the successful employment of universal suffrage an entirely new proletarian tactic had come into being, and this tactic speedily underwent further development. It was found that the governmental institutions in which the dominion of the bourgeoisie had secured organic expression provided a leverage whereby the proletariat could work for the overthrow of these very institutions. The workers participated in the elections to the diets; they voted in the municipal elections; they took their places in the arbitration courts; in their conflict with the bourgeoisie they disputed the possession of every post. The result of all this was that the bourgeoisie and the Government grew far more afraid of the constitutional than of the unconstitutional activities of the working class party, and came to dread the results of an election far more than they dreaded the results of a rebellion.

The day of surprise attacks has passed, the day when small but resolute minorities could achieve revolutions by leading the unwitting masses to the onslaught. Where the question is one of a complete transformation in the social organism, the masses must wittingly participate, must fully understand what they are about. We have learned this from the history of the last 50 years. But if we are to enlighten the masses concerning the issue, prolonged and arduous toil will be requisite. This is the task on which we are now engaged, and with so much success

that our adversaries are becoming desperately alarmed.

The irony of history turns everything topsy-turvy. We, the "revolutionists," thrive better by the use of constitutional means than by unconstitutional and revolutionary methods. The parties of law and order, as they term themselves, are being destroyed by the constitutional implements which they themselves have fashioned.

The paragraph in the "Origin of the Family," from which Keracher quotes, is a long one, and starts on page 209 of Kerr's edition. In the early part of it the following sentences occur:—

The highest form of the State, the democratic republic, knows officially nothing of property distinctions. It is that form of the State which, under modern conditions of society, becomes more and more an unavoidable necessity. *The last decisive struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie can only be fought out under this State form.* (Italics ours.)

The paragraph then ends as follows:—

The possessing class rules directly through universal suffrage. For as long as the oppressed class—in this case the proletariat—is not ripe for its emancipation, just so long will its majority regard the existing order of society as the only one possible, and form the tail, the extreme left wing, of the capitalist class. *But the more the proletariat matures towards its self-emancipation, the more does it constitute itself as a separate class and elect its own representatives in place of the capitalists.* Universal suffrage is the gauge of the maturity of the working class. It can and never will be anything else but that in the modern State. But that is sufficient. On the day when the thermometer of universal suffrage reaches its boiling point among the labourers, they as well as the capitalists will know what to do. (Italics ours.)

On the day when the thermometer reaches its boiling point the workers will have elected a majority of delegates to Parliament. That is Engels' answer to the question. For further evidence let us turn to Engels' "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," p.p. 74—77. (Sonnenschein, 1892).

Whilst the capitalist mode of production more and more completely transforms the great majority of the population into proletarians, it creates the power which, under penalty of its own destruction, is forced to accomplish this revolution. Whilst it forces on more and more the transformation of the vast means of production, already socialised, into State property, it shows itself the way to accomplishing this revolution. *The proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production into State property.*

But, in doing this, it abolishes itself as proletariat, abolishes also the State as State. Society thus far, based upon class antagonisms, had need of the State. That is, of an organisation of the particular class which was *pro tempore* the exploiting class, an organisation for the purpose of preventing any interference from without with the existing conditions of production, and,

therefore, especially for the purpose of forcibly keeping the exploited class in the condition of oppression corresponding with the given mode of production (slavery, serfdom, wage-labour). The State was the official representative of society as a whole; the gathering of it together into a visible embodiment. But it was this only in so far as it was the State of that class which itself represented, for the time being, society as a whole; in ancient times, the state of slave-owning citizens; in the middle ages, the feudal lords; in our own time, the bourgeoisie. When at last it becomes the real representative of the whole of society, it renders itself unnecessary. As soon as there is no longer any social class to be held in subjection; as soon as class rule, and the individual struggle for existence based upon our present anarchy in production, with the collisions and excesses arising from these, are removed, nothing more remains to be repressed, and a special repressive force, a State, is no longer necessary. The first act by virtue of which the State really constitutes itself the representative of the whole of society—the taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—this is at the same time, its last independent act as a State. State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of the processes of production. The state is not "abolished." *It dies out.* (Pp. 74-77.)

III. Proletarian Revolution.—Solution of the contradictions. The proletariat seizes the public power, and by means of this transforms the socialised means of production, slipping from the hands of the bourgeoisie, into public property. By this act the proletariat frees the means of production from the character of capital they have thus far borne, and gives their socialised character complete freedom to work itself out. Socialised production upon a pre-determined plan becomes henceforth possible. The development of production makes the existence of different classes of society thenceforth an anachronism. In proportion as anarchy in social production vanishes, the political authority of the State dies out. Man, at last the master of his own form of social organisation, becomes at the same time the lord over nature, his own master—free. (p. 86.)

Note the commencement of the last paragraph: "The proletariat seizes the public power, and by means of this transforms the socialized means of production . . . into public property," and take along with it the following, from the end of Engels' 1891 Introduction to "The Paris Commune" (New York Lab. News. Co.):—

But in reality the State is nothing else than a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and that no less so in the democratic republic than under the monarchy. At the very best it is an inheritance of evil, bound to be transmitted to the proletariat when it has become victorious in its struggle for class supremacy, and the worst features of which it will have to

lop off at once, as the Commune did, until a new race, grown up under new, free social conditions, will be in a position to shake off from itself this State rubbish in its entirety.

The above quotations prove the correctness, according to Engels, of paragraph 6 of our Declaration of Principles, to which Mr. Keracher takes exception, and also the correctness of the summary of the Marxian view, given in our August number, to which Mr. Keracher also takes exception, i.e., that you cannot carry on Socialism with capitalist governmental machinery; that you must transform the government of one class by another into the administration of social affairs; that between capitalist society and Socialist society lies a period of transformation during which one after another the political forms of to-day will disappear, but the worst features must be lopped off immediately the working class obtains supremacy in the State.

In his last column Mr. Keracher, speaking of ourselves, says:—

They have not yet discovered how the workers of Paris and of Russia got "rid of the armed forces controlled by the capitalists."

The answer is that neither Communists nor Bolsheviks got rid of the armed forces of the capitalists. In each case the capitalists, owing to the exigences of war, did it.

Marx's view of universal suffrage was clearly given in his article on the Chartists, in which he said:—

But universal suffrage is the equivalent for political power for the working class of England, where the proletariat form the large majority of the population, where, in a long, though underground, civil war, it has gained a clear consciousness of its position as a class, and where even the rural districts know no longer any peasants, but landlords, industrial capitalists (farmers) and hired labourers. The carrying of universal suffrage in England, would, therefore, be a far more Socialistic measure than anything which has been honoured with that name on the Continent.

Its inevitable result here, is the political supremacy of the working class. ("N.Y. Tribune," 25th Aug. 1852; quoted by "Labour Monthly," Dec., 1929.)

Keracher, like the rest of the pro-Bolsheviks, tries to foist upon Marx and Engels their own views of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." As was pointed out in the May number of the "S.S.," in all the voluminous writings of Marx and Engels they only use the expression *three* times. Marx twice; once in a *private* letter criticising the "free people's state" (The Gotha Program), and once in the "Class

Struggle in France," where, dealing with the large peasantry and small working class in France, he said that if the workers got power there would be a "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Engels used it only once, at the end of the introduction to the "Paris Commune," where he advised opponents to look at the Paris Commune, that was the dictatorship of the proletariat. And these three references (one of which was not intended for public consumption) are the basis of all the post-war talk of "Dictatorship"!

We have no further space to spare for Mr. Keracher's other twists and turns. The above, however, will give a fair idea of the shifts he is compelled to resort to. In the whole of his twelve columns he failed to show how the working class could obtain control of the armed forces, by ignoring Parliament, and with what force, and how, the Proletarian Party would meet the political power of the capitalists. We are evidently expected to guess this!

GILMAC.

KNOWLEDGE.

The following Books can be obtained from Head Office post free:—

- Anarchism and Socialism.** Plechanoff. 2/9.
- Ancient Society.** Morgan. 6/6.
- Capital** (vols. i., ii. and iii.) 10/6 per volume.
- Communist Manifesto and Civil War in France** (In one vol.) Marx and Engels. 2/9.
- Critique of Political Economy** Marx. 5/6.
- Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.** Engels. 5/3.
- 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon.** Marx. 2/9.
- Evolution of Property.** Lafargue. 2/9.
- Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.** Engels. 2/9.
- Poverty of Philosophy.** Marx. 5/6.
- Revolution and Counter-Revolution.** Marx. 2/9.
- Social and Philosophical Studies.** Lafargue. 2/9.
- Socialism: Utopian and Scientific.** Engels. 2/9.
- Theoretical System of Karl Marx.** Boudin. 5/6.
- Value, Price and Profit.** Marx. 2/9 (cloth).
- Wage-Labour and Capital.** Marx. 5d.

Other books useful to students can also be obtained from the Head Office.

"Socialism and Religion."

This unique Party Pamphlet is now reprinted at a price within the reach of all.

48 pages. TWOPENCE. 2½d. post free.

A SOCIALIST SEARCHLIGHT.

AN "INTELLECTUAL" ON MARX.

To avoid any confusion in the reader's mind it must be explained that at the time when this Manifesto was given to the world, what we know to-day as Socialism, was generally referred to as Communism. Karl Marx was therefore attempting to forecast the evolution of Socialism towards world power. That being so, and considering his confident prediction of class conflict, how can anyone honestly uphold Marxism while in the next breath accepting the theory of Parliamentary evolution as opposed not only to revolution but also to direct action in any form.

It is true that the ballot-box and the doctrines of Marx do not mix very well together. (H. H. Tiltman, in his Life of Ramsay MacDonald, p. 31.)

Such a mass of confusion in one paragraph shows the shallowness and stupidity of Marx's "critics." Class conflicts didn't happen, but Marx predicted them! This from a writer who spends many pages dealing with the miners' lock-out and the General Strike! Mr. Tiltman, full of regard for the sanity of MacDonald, scorns Karl Marx. He does it by erecting a bogey. Any reader of the Communist Manifesto can read Marx's own statement, that the first step in the emancipation of the working class is the conquest of political power—the winning of the battle of democracy. MacDonald's biographer does not tell us where Marx opposed the use of "the ballot box"—because he can't.

The insinuation that Marx was the apostle of "direct action" clearly shows how little Ramsay's admirer knows of Marx's conflict with Bakunin and the other believers in direct action. Mr. Tiltman evidently conceives of revolution as a drama of knives, noise, fireworks and barricades. The use of Parliament by revolutionaries is unknown to these men who "make their own history."

* * *

HOW GREAT MEN DON'T MAKE REVOLUTIONS.

THE BLOKE IN THE SIDE STREET.

The course of revolution, like the course of true love, never did run smooth. All revolutions have some features in common. They are born, not made. They never run to programme, and they can be led down a side street by a great man. It is never possible to have the mass so drilled or imbued by common ideals that a combined push for an agreed goal can be made.

This picturesque view of history, more like a six-reel film than actuality, appears

in "Forward," the I.L.P. paper (July 19th). It is the brain wave of John P. Hay, M.A., of the I.L.P., and Workers' Educational Association. Picture the revolution being led down the alley by the great man! These people think every attempted uprising is a revolution. They never explain why leaders are able to shepherd their ignorant flock; nor do they explain why this great man fades out and another supplants him. Our "great man" philosopher wrote the above while reviewing the situation in China. He tells us that "the revolution happened too soon," and refers to "the frequent splits and divisions among the revolutionaries" there. The great men who make history, according to the hero-worshippers, surely ought not to let little things like starting in advance of the conditions, or meeting with other great men, stand in their way.

Mr. Hay, who always likes to sneer at the Marxist, supplies the knock-out to his own theories in the same article.

FACTORS IN SOCIAL CHANGE.

The Manchu dynasty fell, not on account of a powerful push from the rear, but simply because it could stand no longer. The use of telephone, telegraph, and railway, foreign pressure from the international money lenders, were factors which induced an increase in the number of Chinese with an outlook on the fate of their country. The return of foreign educated Chinese with ideas of the run of history and economics in the West, gave a powerful impulse to the searchings of heart among the thoughtful.

That's what comes of being an opponent of the materialist conception of history. No powerful push by a great man lurking in the rear, but all the factors of modern development are brought in to explain the rise of revolt.

He next tells us that "the lump of national go-as-you-please was too big to be leavened for the economic change." The "great men" could not lop off the "lump," to use the scientific language of our Master of Arts. Sun Yat Sen, he tells us, had to teach economics in order to win support for his policy. Economics comes in, you see, even with the gift of being able to lead revolutions down side streets. Borodin, the Russian Communist, Mr. Hay tells us, could not work a Russian pattern into the Chinese material conditions again defeating leaders making plans for coups and triumphs.

Mr. Hay, M.A., presents just as sad a picture trying to upset Marx's Materialism

as he does when trying to upset Marx's Economics.

* * *

THE GERMAN FASCISTS.

It is interesting to notice how the German Fascists, led by Hitler, outmanoeuvred the reformist parties, the Labour Party and the Communists, by promising reforms of capitalism more drastic than either of them had thought of.

According to the *News Chronicle* and *Star* (17th October), Hitler's programme, now embodied in Bills before Parliament, includes the following reforms: Limitation of interest rate to 5 per cent., of which 1 per cent. is to be taken in taxes; incomes of company directors to be drastically reduced; and all banks be taken over by the State without compensation to the shareholders.

Hitler's attempt to outbid the reformists was so successful that some of his most spectacular successes were in working class constituencies, where formerly the Labour Party or the Communists had been strong. So much for the Labour-Communist theory about leading the workers to Socialism by dangling reforms like carrots in front of their noses. They overlook two things of importance, first, that the workers occasionally want to bite the carrot, and, second, that rival reformists can always step in with sweeter-looking carrots. K.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

LONDON DISTRICT.

- Sunday** ... Liverpool St., Walworth Rd., 11.30 a.m.
Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.45 a.m.
Cock Hotel, East Ham, 7.30 p.m.
Paddington, Prince of Wales, 7.30 p.m.

GLASGOW DISTRICT.

- Sundays** ... West Regent Street, 7.15 p.m.
Thursdays ... Raeberry Street, Maryhill, 8 p.m.

Fill in and post to 42 Great Dover Street, London, S.E. 1, and get this paper regularly.

Please send me the "Socialist Standard" for 12 months, for which I enclose 2/6.

Name

Address

Date

(If required only for 6 months, send 1/3).

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Sec., W. A. Devine, 2 Cupar-road, S.W.11. Branch meets Thursday, 8.30 p.m. at The Waiting Room, Latchmere Baths, entrance in Burns-road. Discussion second Thurs. in month.

BECONTREE.—Sec., Hy. Gratton, 4, Drummond Ave., Brooklands, Romford. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays at 7.30, at above address.

BIRMINGHAM.—Sec., E. Jesper, 32, Rollason-rd., Erdington. Branch meets The Continental Cafe, Moor St., 1st and 3rd Sundays at 11 a.m.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Sec. W. Reynolds, 57, Weymouth Terrace, Hackney Rd. Branch meets every Friday at 8 p.m. at 141, Bow Road. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

GLASGOW.—Branch meets Friday, 8 p.m., at Herald League Book Stall, 39, Shuttle Street, Glasgow. A. Shaw, 118, Henderson Street, Glasgow, C.I.

HACKNEY.—Branch meets Arcadian Cafe, 42, Amherst Road, Hackney, 1st and 3rd Fridays in month, 8 p.m., Discussions 9.30. Communication to Sec. at 21 Bridge Street, Homerton, E. 9.

HULL.—Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month at 15, Grosvenor Street, Beverley Road. Communications to M. V. Coupland at above address.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144, Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to that address.

LEYTON.—Sec., 396, Lea Bridge-rd., Leyton. Branch meets 8 p.m., Trades and Labour Hall, Grove House, High-rd., second Mondays in month.

MANCHESTER.—Sec., W. Addison. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Mondays in month at 8.15 p.m. at Room 2, 183 Oxford Road, All Saints.

PADDINGTON.—Branch meeting held on 2nd and 4th Fridays, 8 p.m., in room above the Co-operative Stores, 306, Kilburn Lane, W.9 (side door).

SHEFFIELD.—Branch meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays 7.30 p.m., Room 5, Trades Hall, Charles Street. Public discussion after business. Secretary E. Boden, 74, Glenalmond Road.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Sec., J. Bird, 5, Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.

SOUTHWARK.—Branch meets Fridays at 8 p.m., 42, Great Dover Street, S.E.1. Communications to Sec., at above address.

TOOTING.—Branch meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursday in the month at the Tooting Adult School, 971, Garratt Lane, S.W.17. Sec. (pro-tem), H. E. Hutchins, 174, Haydon's Road, South Wimbledon, S.W. 19.

TOTTENHAM.—Secretary, 18, Woodlands Park Rd., N.15. Branch meets Fridays, Room 2, Trades Hall, 7, Bruce Grove, Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Sec. S. E. Williams, 64, Bloxham-rd., Leyton, E.10. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107, Kensington-avenue, Watford. Branch meets Mondays at 8.30 p.m. at Secretary's address.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167, Romford-rd., Stratford. Sec., P. Hallard, 22, Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—All communications to Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 71, Falkland Road, N. 8. Branch meets 2nd 2nd and 4th Wednesday in month at 8.30 p.m. at Stirling House, Stuart Crescent.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.—The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interests of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great HOLDS— Britain

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.